



**MARK WARDLAW**  
*Director*

**BETH A. MURRAY**  
*Assistant Director*

**County of San Diego**  
**PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES**

5510 OVERLAND AVENUE, SUITE 110, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92123  
INFORMATION (858) 694-2960  
TOLL FREE (800) 411-0017  
[www.sdcountry.ca.gov/pds](http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov/pds)

**Statement of Reasons for Exemption from  
Additional Environmental Review and 15183 Checklist  
Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15183**

**Date:** April 19, 2013  
**Project Title:** Butterfield Trails Ranch, PDS2008-3100-5551(TM), PDS2008-3300-08-028 (MUP); PDS2008-3910-0608033(ER).  
**Plan Area:** Valley Center  
**GP Designation:** (VR-2) Village Residential  
**Density:** 2 du/acre  
**Zoning:** RR Rural Residential  
**Min. Lot Size:** 0.5 acre (0.25 acre for a Planned Residential Development (PRD))  
**Special Area Reg.:** None  
**Lot Size:** 0.3 to 0.64 acre  
**Applicant:** Wayne Hilbig, Butterfield Trails LLC, P.O. Box 16, La Jolla, CA 92038 (858) 349-6323  
**Staff Contact:** Larry Hofreiter - (858) 694-8846  
Larry.hofreiter@sdcounty.ca.gov

**Project Description**

The project is a major subdivision to divide a 59.5-acre property. An application for a Major Use Permit has been submitted to form a Planned Residential Development (PRD) to cluster the residential portion of the project up to 50 percent or 0.25-acre for the Butterfield Trails Ranch project. There will be 71 residential lots on 26.1 gross acres (39.5% of the project site). Nine remaining lots on 33.4 acres (60.5 percent of the project site) will be common lots for (1) environmental open space on 28.6 acres (50.1 percent of the project site) and (2) right of way and other common areas on 5.9 acres (10.4 percent of the project site).

The project site is located in the Valley Center Town Center of the Valley Center Community Plan Area. Access to the site is from Valley Center Road, via Sunday Drive, which would be renamed Butterfield Trails Drive if the project is approved. The project includes improvements to Valley Center Road south of Sunday Drive (removal of raised median and installation of two-way center turn lane for approximately 650 feet). Water and Sewer would be provided by the Valley Center Municipal Water District and sewer service requires improvements anticipated in the South Village Service Area Master Plan FEIR dated April 7, 2008 and Addendum dated January 2013 be complete prior to approval of the Final Map. The Valley Center Fire Protection District

and the San Diego County Fire Authority will serve the project and they have approved the Fire Protection Plan and emergency fire access. The proposed grading would be balanced at 120,000 cubic yards. The maximum daily grading for the project is expected to be 1,100 cubic yards per day. Implementation of the Tentative Map would be completed in one phase. With the exception of an existing barn, (which would be used for maintenance purposes), the project would include the demolition of three existing single-family and appurtenant structures.

The project site is subject to the Country Town General Plan Regional Category and the (VR-2) Village Residential Land Use Designation (0.5 dwelling units per acre). Zoning for the project site is (RR) Rural Residential, which allows a 0.5-acre minimum lot size, but may decrease the lot size by 50 percent with approval of a Major Use Permit under the PRD regulations. The updated Valley Center Community Plan, Section C.8 Clustering) does not include a minimum lot size. The Butterfield Trails Ranch project lots range from 0.3 to 0.6 acre in size (13,070 – 27,835 square feet) for a density of 0.8 dwelling units per acre. Therefore, the project is consistent with density and lot size requirements of the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance.

### **Overview**

California Public Resources Code section 21083.3 and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15183 provide an exemption from additional environmental review for projects that are consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan or general plan policies for which an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was certified, except as might be necessary to examine whether there are project-specific significant effects which are peculiar to the project or its site. Section 15183 specifies that examination of environmental effects shall be limited to those effects that: (1) are peculiar to the project or the parcel on which the project would be located, and were not analyzed as significant effects in a prior EIR on the zoning action, general plan, or community plan, with which the project is consistent, (2) are potentially significant off-site impacts and cumulative impacts which were not discussed in the prior EIR prepared for the general plan, community plan or zoning action, or (3) are previously identified significant effects which, as a result of substantial new information which was not known at the time the EIR was certified, are determined to have a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the prior EIR. Section 15183(c) further specifies that if an impact is not peculiar to the parcel or to the proposed project, has been addressed as a significant effect in the prior EIR, or can be substantially mitigated by the imposition of uniformly applied development policies or standards, then an additional EIR need not be prepared for that project solely on the basis of that impact.

### **General Plan Update Program EIR**

The County of San Diego General Plan Update (GPU) establishes a blueprint for future land development in the unincorporated County that meets community desires and balances the environmental protection goals with the need for housing, agriculture, infrastructure, and economic vitality. The GPU applies to all of the unincorporated portions of San Diego County and directs population growth and plans for infrastructure needs, development, and resource protection. The GPU included adoption of new General Plan elements, which set the goals and policies that guide future development. It also included a corresponding land use map, a County Road Network map, updates to Community and Subregional Plans, an Implementation Plan, and other implementing policies and ordinances. The GPU focuses population growth in the western areas of the County where infrastructure and services are available in order to reduce the potential for growth in the eastern areas. The objectives of this population distribution strategy are to: 1) facilitate efficient, orderly growth by containing development within areas potentially served by the San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA) or other existing infrastructure; 2) protect natural resources through the reduction of population capacity in sensitive areas; and 3) retain or enhance the character of communities within the unincorporated County. The SDCWA

service area covers approximately the western one third of the unincorporated County. The SDWCA boundary generally represents where water and wastewater infrastructure currently exist. This area is more developed than the eastern areas of the unincorporated County, and would accommodate more growth under the GPU.

The GPU EIR was certified in conjunction with adoption of the GPU on August 3, 2011. The GPU EIR comprehensively evaluated environmental impacts that would result from Plan implementation, including information related to existing site conditions, analyses of the types and magnitude of project-level and cumulative environmental impacts, and feasible mitigation measures that could reduce or avoid environmental impacts.

## Summary of Findings

The Butterfield Trails Ranch, PDS2008-3100-5551(TM), PDS2008-3300-08-028 (MUP), is consistent with the analysis performed for the GPU EIR. Further, the GPU EIR adequately anticipated and described the impacts of the proposed project, identified applicable mitigation measures necessary to reduce project specific impacts, and the project implements these mitigation measures. See [http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/PDS/gpupdate/docs/BOS\\_Aug2011/EIR/FEIR\\_7.00\\_-\\_Mitigation\\_Measures\\_2011.pdf](http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/PDS/gpupdate/docs/BOS_Aug2011/EIR/FEIR_7.00_-_Mitigation_Measures_2011.pdf) for complete list of GPU Mitigation Measures.

A comprehensive environmental evaluation has been completed for the project as documented in the attached §15183 Exemption Checklist. This evaluation concludes that the project qualifies for an exemption from additional environmental review because it is consistent with the development density and use characteristics established by the County of San Diego General Plan, as analyzed by the San Diego County General Plan Update Final Program EIR (GPU EIR, ER #02-ZA-001, SCH #2002111067), and all required findings can be made.

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines §15183, the project qualifies for an exemption because the following findings can be made:

**1. The project is consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan or general plan policies for which an EIR was certified.**

The applicant would subdivide approximately 60-acres into 71 residential lots, which is consistent with the (VR-2) Village Residential development density established by the General Plan and the certified GPU EIR.

**2. There are no project specific effects which are peculiar to the project or its site, and which the GPU EIR Failed to analyze as significant effects.**

There are no project specific effects which are peculiar to the project or its site. The project site is located in an area developed with similarly sized, estate residential lots with associated accessory uses. The property does not support any peculiar environmental features, and the project would not result in any peculiar effects.

In addition, as explained further in the 15183 Checklist below, all project impacts were adequately analyzed by the GPU EIR. The project could result in potentially significant impacts to Biology, Cultural, Noise, Traffic and Climate Change resources and all impacts were previously analyzed by the GPU EIR. Applicable mitigation measures specified within the GPU EIR have been made conditions of approval for this project.

**3. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which the GPU EIR failed to evaluate.**

The proposed project is consistent with the density and use characteristics of the development considered by the GPU EIR and would represent a small part of the growth that was forecast for build-out of the General Plan. The GPU EIR considered the incremental impacts of the proposed project, and as explained further in the 15183 Exemption Checklist below, no potentially significant off-site or cumulative impacts have been identified which were not previously evaluated.

**4. There is no substantial new information which results in more severe impacts than anticipated by the GPU EIR.**

As explained in the 15183 exemption checklist below, no new information has been identified which would result in a determination of a more severe impact than what had been anticipated by the GPU EIR. This project's significant effects were anticipated in the GPU EIR analysis and the County is implementing mitigation specified in the GPU EIR.

**5. The project has implemented the applicable GPU EIR mitigation measures.**

As explained in the 15183 exemption checklist below, the feasible GPU EIR mitigation measures have been implemented through project design, compliance with regulations and ordinances, or will be implemented through the project's conditions of approval.

_____ Signature	_____ <b>April 19, 2013</b> Date
_____ <b>Larry Hofreiter</b> Printed Name	_____ <b>Project Manager</b> Title

## **CEQA Guidelines §15183 Exemption Checklist**

### **Overview**

This checklist provides an analysis of potential environmental impacts resulting from the proposed project. Following the format of CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, environmental effects are evaluated to determine if the project would result in a potentially significant impact triggering additional review under Guidelines section 15183.

- Items checked “Significant Project Impact” indicates that the project could result in a significant effect which either requires mitigation to be reduced to a less than significant level or which has a significant, unmitigated impact.
- Items checked “Peculiar Impact not identified by GPU EIR” indicates that the project would result in a project specific significant impact in a manner which is considered unusual or uncommon and was not identified in the GPU EIR.
- Items checked “Substantial New Information” indicates that there is new information which leads to a determination that a project impact is more severe than what had been anticipated by the GPU EIR.

A project does not qualify for a §15183 exemption if it is determined that it would result in: 1) a peculiar impact that was not identified as a significant impact under the GPU EIR; 2) a more severe impact due to new information; or 3) a potentially significant off-site impact or cumulative impact not discussed in the GPU EIR.

A summary of staff’s analysis of each potential environmental effect is provided below the checklist for each subject area. A list of references, significance guidelines, and technical studies used to support the analysis is also provided. The complete list of GPU EIR mitigation measures is attached.

### **AESTHETIC RESOURCES**

The project site setting is a distant view and only partially visible from public locations, roads and trails. The project is generally consistent with the existing visual character of the community (Lewis, 2011). The GPU EIR determined there was a potential to result in impacts to aesthetic resources from the development of land uses proposed under the GPU, including the potential for direct and cumulative impacts and significant impacts to visual character, scenic resources, and light and glare from future development. General Plan Update policies and mitigation measures would reduce impacts to aesthetic resources but not to below a level of significance. These impacts were anticipated in the GPU EIR Aesthetic Resources Chapter and mitigation measures were proposed.

	Significant Project Impact	Peculiar Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
<b>1. Aesthetics</b> – Would the Project:			
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion

- 1(a) No. The project will convert 33.7 acres of existing residential and former equestrian uses to 71 residential units, between Moosa Creek and a steep granite escarpment. However, the site is not readily visible from any public location, road or trail. The site is not located within a viewshed of a scenic vista.
- 1(b) No. The property is not within the viewshed of a County or state scenic highway. The project site also does not support any significant scenic resources that would be lost or modified through development of the property.
- 1(c) No. While within a Resource Conservation Area (Lancaster Mountain, Keys Canyon Lilac Creed) for woodland resources, the project would be consistent with existing community character as it is adjacent to the Woods Valley Specific Plan area and is in an area that has been farmed for decades. This Valley Center area is characterized by residential uses set back from the wooded creek. The addition of 71 new residential lots similar to the existing residential uses would not substantially degrade the visual quality of the site or its surroundings.
- 1(d) No. Residential lighting would be required to conform with the County's Light Pollution Code to prevent spillover onto adjacent properties and minimize impacts to dark skies.

### Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in significant aesthetic impacts; therefore, the project would not result in any impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

### AGRICULTURAL/FORESTRY RESOURCES

While portions of the site have been used for horse ranching, it has not been used for agriculture as defined by the County of San Diego Zoning regulations. The GPU EIR determined there was a potential to result in impacts to agricultural resources from the development of land uses proposed under the GPU, including the potential for direct and cumulative impacts and significant impacts from conversion of agricultural resources and land use conflicts from future development. General Plan Update policies and mitigation measures would reduce impacts to

agricultural resources but not to below a level of significance. These impacts were anticipated in the GPU EIR Agricultural Resources Chapter and mitigation measures were proposed.

	Significant Project Impact	Peculiar Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
<b>2. Agriculture/Forestry Resources</b>			
– Would the Project:			
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, or other agricultural resources, to a non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land, conversion of forest land to non-forest use, or involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Important Farmland or other agricultural resources, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion

- 2(a) No. The FMMP designates the project site with 29 acres of 'Other' and 'Built-up' Lands and 39 acres of Farmland of Local Importance. However, agricultural uses have not occurred in recent history on the property, and the most recent use has been horse ranching and residential, then on only a portion of the property. No evidence of agricultural uses exists on the site since the year 2004, which is six years prior to the last FMMP mapping date. In order to qualify for the Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance designations, the project must have been cropped at some time during the four years prior to the last FMMP mapping date. Given the lack of agricultural use on the site, the designation of 39 acres of Farmland of Local Importance is likely misapplied, resulting from the large scale of the Statewide mapping effort, which assigns Farmland designations based on aerial photography and limited ground verification. Therefore, due to the lack of historic agricultural use at the project site, the site does not meet the definition of an agricultural resource and no potentially significant project or cumulative level conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance to a non-agricultural use will occur resulting from this project.
- 2(b) No. The project site is not located within or adjacent to a Williamson Act contract or agriculturally zoned land.

- 2(c) No. There are no timberland production zones on or near the property.
- 2(d) No. The project site is not located near any forest lands.
- 2(e) No. Based on the property not being an agricultural resource and the lack of recent on-site agricultural uses, the designation of 39 acres of Farmland of Local Importance is likely misapplied, resulting from the large scale of the Statewide mapping effort. Therefore, due to the lack of historic agricultural use at the project site, the site does not meet the definition of an agricultural resource and no potentially significant project or cumulative level conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance to a non-agricultural use will occur resulting from this project.

### Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in a significant impact to agricultural resources; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

### AIR QUALITY

Air quality emissions generated by the project would be from traffic (852 ADT) and from construction. Grading for the project is 120,000 cubic yards over 32.0 acres and approximately 3,750 cubic yards per acre; the project description estimates grading of 1,100 cubic yards per day. The GPU EIR determined there was a potential to result in significant direct and cumulative impacts to air quality from the development of land uses proposed under the GPU, including the potential for air quality violations, an increase in non-attainment criteria pollutants, and impacts to sensitive receptors from future development. General Plan Update policies and mitigation measures would reduce impacts to aesthetic resources but not to below a level of significance. These impacts were anticipated in the GPU EIR Air Quality Chapter and mitigation measures were proposed.

	Significant Project Impact	Peculiar Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
<b>3. Air Quality</b> – Would the Project:			
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) or applicable portions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

☐☐☐

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

☐☐☐

### Discussion

3(a) No. The applicant proposes development with density levels that are less than densities anticipated in the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) growth projections used in development of the RAQS and SIP. The site is currently subject to the General Plan (VR-2) Village Residential that allows a density of 2 dwelling units per acre. The Butterfield project lots range from 0.3 to 0.6 acres in size (13,070 – 27,835 square feet) for a density of 0.8 dwelling units per acre. Operation of the project will result in emissions of ozone precursors that were considered as a part of the RAQS based on growth projections. As such, the proposed project is not expected to conflict with either the RAQS or the SIP. In addition, the operational emissions from the project would be below the screening levels, and subsequently will not violate ambient air quality.

3(b) No. In general, air quality impacts from land use projects are the result of emissions from motor vehicles, and from short-term construction activities associated with such projects. The San Diego County Land Use Environment Group (LUEG) has established guidelines for determining significance which incorporate the San Diego Air Pollution Control District's (SDAPCD) established screening-level criteria for all new source review (NSR) in SDAPCD Rule 20.2. These screening-level criteria can be used as numeric methods to demonstrate that a project's total emissions (e.g. stationary and fugitive emissions, as well as emissions from mobile sources) would not result in a significant impact to air quality. Since SDAPCD does not have screening-level criteria for emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), the screening levels for reactive organic compounds (ROC) from the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) for the Coachella Valley (which are more appropriate for the San Diego Air Basin) are used.

The project proposes 120,000 cubic yards of cut and 120,000 cubic yards of fill with a maximum cut/fill slope of 2:1. Grading operations associated with the construction of the project would be subject to County of San Diego Grading Ordinance, which requires the implementation of dust control measures. The project engineer expects to have demolition and grading completed in approximately four months, paving completed in less than a month, and construction of the houses in eight months under the worst-case construction scenario (based on data provided in the Global Climate Change Study prepared by Ldn Consulting, Inc.). Additionally, maximum daily grading for the project would be approximately 1,100 cubic yards of cut/fill per day. Emissions from the construction phase would be minimal, temporary and localized, resulting in pollutant emissions below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance. In addition, the vehicle trips generated from the project will result in 852 Average Daily Trips (ADTs). According to the County of San Diego LUEG *Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements – Air Quality*, the operational phase air quality trigger criterion for a single-family residential development is 300 units. This represents the project size that would be anticipated to generate air emissions greater than LUEG's screening level thresholds. The project proposes the development of 71 residential units. As such, the project will not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

- 3(c) No. San Diego County is presently in non-attainment for the National and California Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS and CAAQS, respectively) for ozone ( $O_3$ ). San Diego County is also presently in non-attainment for the annual geometric mean and for the 24-hour concentrations of Particulate Matter less than or equal to 10 microns ( $PM_{10}$ ) and Particulate Matter less than or equal to 2.5 microns ( $PM_{2.5}$ ) under the CAAQS.  $O_3$  is formed when volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and oxides of nitrogen ( $NO_x$ ) react in the presence of sunlight. VOC sources include any source that burns fuels (e.g., gasoline, natural gas, wood, oil); solvents; petroleum processing and storage; and pesticides. Sources of  $PM_{10}$  in both urban and rural areas include: motor vehicles, wood burning stoves and fireplaces, dust from construction, landfills, agriculture, wildfires, brush/waste burning, and industrial sources of windblown dust from open lands.

Air quality emissions associated with the project include emissions of  $PM_{10}$ ,  $PM_{2.5}$ ,  $NO_x$  and VOCs from construction/grading activities, and also as the result of increase of traffic from project implementation. Grading operations associated with the construction of the project would be subject to the County of San Diego Grading Ordinance, which requires the implementation of dust control measures. Additionally, maximum daily grading for the project would be approximately 1,100 cubic yards of cut/fill per day. As discussed under question 3(b) above, emissions from the construction phase would be minimal, localized and temporary resulting in criteria air pollutant and precursor emissions below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance. The project's operational phase emissions would be below LUEG's operational air quality trigger criterion (see question 3(b) above).

In addition, a list of past, present and future projects within the surrounding area were evaluated and none of these projects emit significant amounts of criteria pollutants. The proposed project as well as the past, present and future projects within the surrounding area, have emissions below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance, therefore, the construction and operational emissions associated with the proposed project are not expected to create a cumulatively considerable impact nor a considerable net increase of  $PM_{10}$ ,  $PM_{2.5}$ , or any  $O_3$  precursors.

- 3(d) No. Air quality regulators typically define sensitive receptors as schools (Preschool-12<sup>th</sup> Grade), hospitals, resident care facilities, or day-care centers, or other facilities that may house individuals with health conditions that would be adversely impacted by changes in air quality. The County of San Diego also considers residences as sensitive receptors since they house children and the elderly.

The following sensitive receptors have been identified within a quarter-mile (the radius determined by the SCAQMD in which the dilution of pollutants is typically significant) of the proposed project: rural residential development to the north and west and specific plan residential and natural land to the east. However, based on review by a PDS staff air quality specialist, this project does not propose uses or activities that would result in exposure of these identified sensitive receptors to significant pollutant concentrations and will not place sensitive receptors near carbon monoxide hotspots. The project will introduce the following new "sensitive receptors" into the project area: residential uses. However, based on review by PDS staff air quality specialist, the project is not located within a quarter-mile of any identified point source of significant emissions and will not place receptors near any carbon monoxide hotspots. In addition, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations because the proposed project as well as the listed projects have

emissions below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance.

- 3(e) No. The project could produce objectionable odors, which would result from volatile organic compounds, ammonia, carbon dioxide, hydrogen sulfide, methane, alcohols, aldehydes, amines, carbonyls, esters, disulfides dust and endotoxins from the construction and operational phases. However, these substances, if present at all, would only be in trace amounts (less than  $1 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ ). Subsequently, no significant air quality – odor impacts are expected to affect surrounding receptors. Moreover, the affects of objectionable odors are localized to the immediate surrounding area and will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable odor.

### Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to air quality; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

## BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Biological resources on the project site were evaluated in a Biological Resources Report prepared by Affinis dated March 2, 2011. The site contains 27 acres of intensive agriculture (old horse ranch), 16.9 acres of unvegetated/disturbed habitat, 8.8 acres of coastal sage scrub, 3.9 acres of coast live oak woodland, 0.2 acre of riparian woodland and riparian forest habitat, and 0.5 acre of freshwater marsh open water habitat. Development would occur on 33.7 acres, the remaining 26.2 acres of the site would be dedicated in biological open space. According to 2004, 2007, and 2010 surveys, one sensitive wildlife species has been identified on site, red shouldered hawk (*Buteo lineatus*); and three other sensitive species have been observed in the southern willow scrub adjacent to the site, least Bell's vireo (*Vireo belli pusillus*), yellow warbler (*Dendroica petechia brewsteri*) and yellow breasted chat (*Eremophila alpestris actia*). One sensitive plant species, Engelmann oak (*Quercus engelmannii*) was identified onsite. The project qualified for a *de minimus* exemption for Habitat Loss under the NCCP according to the exemption request letter dated August 2, 2012 and the concurrence received from the Wildlife Agencies.

The GP EIR analysis indicated there would be the potential for direct and/or indirect impacts to biological resources from the development of land uses proposed under the GPU. General Plan Update policies and mitigation measures would reduce impacts to special status species, riparian habitats and other sensitive communities, and wildlife movement corridors but not to below a level of significance. These impacts were anticipated in the GPU EIR Biological Resources Chapter and mitigation measures were proposed.

	Significant Project Impact	Peculiar Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
<b>4. Biological Resources – Would the Project:</b>			
Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?



c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?



d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?



e) Conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources?

**Discussion**

4(a) **Yes. Significant Project Impact to Special Status Species.** As described above, biological resources on the project site were evaluated in a Biological Resources Report prepared by Affinis dated March 2, 2011 and one sensitive wildlife species was identified on site, red shouldered hawk (*Buteo lineatus*) and three species were observed in the southern willow scrub adjacent to the site: Least Bell's vireo (*Vireo belli pusillus*), yellow warbler (*Dendroica petechia brewsteri*) and yellow breasted chat (*Eremophila alpestris actia*). One sensitive plant species, Engelmann oak (*Quercus engelmannii*) was also observed. In addition to onsite mitigation and onsite revegetation, breeding season avoidance will be implemented as a mitigation measure that restricts brushing, clearing, and/or grading during avian breeding and nesting. Therefore, the biological habitat and sensitive species will be adequately mitigated by implementation of the mitigation measures described above and the project will not result in substantial adverse effects, or have a cumulatively considerable impact to species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

4(b) **Yes. Significant Project Impact to Sensitive Natural Communities.** Based on the Biological Resources Report, the following sensitive natural communities were identified on the site: non-native grassland, coastal sage scrub, and southern mixed chaparral. As detailed in response a) above, direct and indirect impacts to sensitive natural communities identified in the RPO, NCCP, Fish and Wildlife Code, and Endangered Species Act are mitigated through ordinance compliance and implementation of onsite preservation. Based on the Biological Resources Map prepared by Affinis, it has been determined that a former channel of Moosa Creek runs along the Southern boundary of

the project. The creek was relocated by the Woods Valley Golf course project, the main stream now runs south of the property on the adjacent Golf Course. The project side still contains wetland and riparian woodland and riparian forest habitat within the project boundaries. Although the project site contains this habitat, the areas proposed for development will completely avoid direct impacts considered significant to any portion of the wetland and riparian woodland though the implementation of a Biological Open Space Easement. The development is setback a minimum of 75 feet and more to protect the habitat from potential indirect impacts, including noise, lighting, human encroachment and invasive species. Furthermore, no off-site impacts have been identified within or immediately adjacent to the riparian or otherwise sensitive habitat. Therefore, proposed mitigation measures will reduce impacts to less than significant since no direct impacts are expected to occur to any riparian habitats or sensitive natural community identified in the County of San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Program, County of San Diego Resource Protection Ordinance, Natural Community Conservation Plan, Fish and Wildlife Code, Endangered Species Act, Clean Water Act, or any other local or regional plans, policies or regulations.

- 4(c) No. The project site contains federally-protected wetlands defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Staff reviewed the Biological Resources Map prepared by Affinis and dated March 2011, and determined the project to be in compliance with Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. The project will not impact through, discharging into, directly removing, filling, or hydrologically interrupting, any federally protected wetlands supported on the project site. The project proposes complete avoidance. Also, the development is setback a minimum of 75 feet and more to protect the wetland habitat from potential indirect impacts. Therefore, all impacts will be avoided because federally protected wetlands have been placed in a biological open space or conservation easement with the appropriate wetland buffer as a part of a previous action and no significant impacts will occur to federally protected wetlands on the project site. Therefore, no significant impacts will occur to wetlands or waters of the U.S. that are regulated under the Army Corps of Engineers.
- 4(d) No. Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, and the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, staff determined that the development footprint has limited biological value. The site predominantly contains intensive agriculture (old horse ranch), residential, and unvegetated, urban disturbed land, which is not ideal for wildlife movement corridors or nursery sites. Properties north (on top of the escarpment), east, and west of the site are either managed for farming or contain residential development. To the immediate south of the site there is Moosa Creek which is an existing corridor. This project is proposing revegetation that would expand and buffer the riparian habitat on and offsite. Therefore, it is not expected that the proposed project would result in impedance of the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, the use of an established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, and/or the use of native wildlife nursery sites.
- 4(e) No. The project is subject to the Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO) and the Habitat Loss Permit (HLP) Ordinance (an NCCP for Coastal Sage Scrub - CSS). The project conforms to both ordinances. The Wildlife Agencies concurred that the take of CSS on the project site qualified for a "de minimus exemption".

The GPU EIR imposed the following mitigation for these impacts (Bio-1.1, Bio-1.2, Bio-1-5, Bio-1-6, Bio-1-7, Bio-2-1, Bio-2-3, and Bio-2-4). The Butterfield Ranch Project will be implementing measures consistent with the GPU EIR mitigation measures.

Bio-1.1 is the preparation of a Conservation Subdivision Program that facilitates conservation-oriented project design through changes to the Subdivision Ordinance, Resource Protection Ordinance, Zoning Ordinance, and Groundwater Ordinance. This program will promote conservation of natural resources and open space while improving mechanisms for flexibility in project design so that production of housing stock is not negatively impacted. Additionally, any such allowances of flexibility must be done with consideration of community character through planning group coordination and/or findings required for project approval.

Bio-1.2 requires the County to implement and revise existing Habitat Conservation Plans/Policies to preserve sensitive resources within a cohesive system of open space; and to continue preparation of Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Plans for North County and East County. Implementation of the existing South County MSCP has been very effective in preserving candidate species and their habitat as intended; and this measure will ensure that this success is continued and carried forward to future MSCP efforts.

Bio-1.5 directs the County to utilize County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Biological Resources to identify adverse impacts to biological resources, and to utilize the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records and the Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species to locate special status species populations on or near project sites. This information will be used to avoid or mitigate potential project impacts in the County as appropriate.

Bio-1.6 is the implementation of the Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO), the Biological Mitigation Ordinance (BMO), and the Habitat Loss Permit (HLP) Ordinance to protect wetlands, wetland buffers, sensitive habitat lands, biological resource core areas, linkages, corridors, high-value habitat areas, subregional coastal sage scrub focus areas, and populations of rare, or endangered plant or animal species. These ordinances are part of the County regulatory code and explicitly mandate preservation of sensitive biological resources.

Bio-1.7 requires the County to minimize edge effects from development projects located near sensitive resources by implementing the County Noise Ordinance, the County Groundwater Ordinance, the County's Landscaping Regulations (currently part of the Zoning Ordinance), and the County Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance. Implementation of these ordinances reduces potential indirect impacts to special status species and their habitats.

Bio-2.1 requires the County to revise the Ordinance Relating to Water Conservation for Landscaping to incorporate appropriate plant types and regulations requiring planting of native or compatible non-native, non-invasive plant species in new development. For applicable project subject to this ordinance, this measure will prevent indirect impacts to riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities associated with invasive plant species.

Bio-2.3 is the requirement that wetlands and wetland buffer areas are adequately preserved whenever feasible to maintain biological functions and values. While this preservation requirement is applied to project permits subject to the Resource Protection Ordinance, this mitigation measure ensures that the same level of protection is applied

whenever feasible to other projects. As such, potential impacts to riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities will be reduced.

Bio-2.4 is the implementation of the Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance to protect wetlands. By applying these provisions to development projects, potential indirect impacts to riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities from stormwater runoff will be reduced.

General Plan Update policies and mitigation measures would reduce cumulative impacts to special status species and to sensitive natural communities and cumulative impacts associated with wildlife movement corridors and nursery sites, but not to below a level of significance. The County has adopted an MSCP South County Subarea Plan for the southwestern portion of the County, but is still developing MSCP Plans for North County and East County areas. Therefore, until the County has adopted the North County and East County Plans with concurrence from State and federal agencies, the project's contribution, in combination with other cumulative projects, would be cumulatively considerable. The Butterfield Trails Ranch project was reviewed by the Wildlife Agencies at batching meetings and they concurred with the project design.

The Butterfield Trails Ranch Biological Resource Report utilized the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Biology. The project includes onsite habitat preservation and onsite revegetation (1.9 acres of oak woodland mitigation will take place by revegetation onsite or offsite purchase of credits in a County-approved mitigation bank). Breeding season avoidance will be implemented as a mitigation measure that restricts brushing, clearing, and/or grading during the avian breeding season. Although the project site contains riparian habitat, the areas proposed for development will completely avoid direct impacts considered significant to any portion of the wetland and riparian woodland through the implementation of a Biological Open Space Easement. The development is setback a minimum of 75 feet and more to protect the habitat from potential indirect impacts, including noise, lighting, human encroachment and invasive species. Based on the analysis, the project would not result in significant biological impacts not anticipated by the GPU EIR.

**BIOLOGICAL EASEMENT:** In order to protect sensitive biological resources, pursuant to the [Resource Protection Ordinance \(RPO\)](#), a biological open space easement shall be granted. Grant to the County of San Diego, an open space easement, as shown on the approved Tentative Map and conceptual grading plan. This easement is for the protection of biological resources and prohibits all of the following on any portion of the land subject to said easement: grading; excavation; placement of soil, sand, rock, gravel, or other material; clearing of vegetation; construction, erection, or placement of any building or structure; vehicular activities; trash dumping; or use for any purpose other than as open space. Granting of this open space authorizes the County and its agents to periodically access the land to perform management and monitoring activities for the purposes of species and habitat conservation.

**LBZ EASEMENT:** In order to protect sensitive biological resources, pursuant to the [Resource Protection Ordinance \(RPO\)](#), a Limited Building Zone Easement shall be granted to limit the need to clear or modify vegetation for fire protection purposes within an adjacent biological resource area. Grant to the County of San Diego a Limited Building Zone Easement as shown on the Tentative Map and conceptual grading plan. The purpose of this easement is to limit the need to clear or modify vegetation for fire protection purposes within the adjacent biological open space easement and prohibit the construction or placement of any structure designed or intended for occupancy by humans or animals.

**OPEN SPACE SIGNAGE:** In order to protect the proposed open space easement from entry, informational signs shall be installed. Open space signs shall be placed along the biological open space boundary of lots(s) 11-19, 56-71, and 79 as indicated on the approved Tentative Map and preliminary grading plan.

**REVEGETATION PLAN:** In order to mitigate for the impacts to wetlands and coast live oak woodlands, which is a sensitive biological resource pursuant to [Resource Protection Ordinance \(RPO\)](#), revegetation shall occur. A Revegetation Plan, shall be prepared, which will create 2.47 acres of southern arroyo willow riparian forest and coast live oak forest within Lot 80. The revegetation will create an additional buffer to Moosa creek and provide additional habitat for least Bell's vireo. The revegetation plan shall conform to the Conceptual Revegetation Plan, and the most current version of the [County of San Diego Report Format and Content Requirements for Revegetation Plans](#).

**RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN:** In order to provide for the long-term management of the proposed open space preserve, a Resource Management Plan (RMP) shall be prepared and implemented. Submit to and receive approval from the Director of the Planning & Development Services, a Resource Management Plan (RMP). The RMP shall be for the perpetual management of all onsite open space.

**BIOLOGICAL MONITORING:** In order to prevent inadvertent disturbance to biological open space, all grading located within 300 feet of the open space shall be monitored by a biologist. A County approved biologist "Project Biologist" shall be contracted to perform biological monitoring during all grading, clearing, grubbing, trenching, and construction activities.

**TEMPORARY FENCING:** In order to prevent inadvertent disturbance to wetlands and proposed biological open space, temporary construction fencing shall be installed. Prior to the commencement of any grading and or clearing in association with this grading plan, temporary orange construction fencing shall be placed to protect from inadvertent disturbance of all open space easements that do not allow grading, brushing or clearing. Temporary fencing is also required in all locations of the project where proposed grading or clearing is within 100 feet of an open space easement boundary. The placement of such fencing shall be approved by the PDS, Permit Compliance Section. Upon approval, the fencing shall remain in place until the conclusion of grading activities after which the fencing shall be removed.

**RESOURCE AVOIDANCE:** In order to avoid potential impacts to least Bell's vireo, raptors, and California Gnatcatcher, which are sensitive biological resources pursuant to CEQA and County Biological Guidelines, a Resource Avoidance Area (RAA), shall be implemented on all plans. There shall be no brushing, clearing and/or grading allowed during the breeding season for least Bell's vireo (March 15 to September 15) within 200 feet of the off-site riparian habitat, unless pre-construction surveys are conducted to determine that this species is no longer present in this habitat; or unless a temporary noise barrier is constructed and it is verified that noise levels within the habitat area are reduced to below 65 dBA. Similarly, no clearing, grading, or grubbing shall be conducted during raptor breeding season (January 15-July 15 for tree-nesting raptors; February 1-July 15 for ground-nesting raptors) unless preconstruction surveys are conducted to confirm that no raptor nests are present within 500 feet of the grading or clearing. The Director of Planning and Development Services (PDS), PCC] may waive this condition based on preconstruction surveys and monitoring, provided that nesting birds will not be affected by the brushing, clearing or grading.



**OPEN SPACE SIGNAGE & FENCING:** Fencing and signage shall be installed along the open space boundary of lots(s) 11-19, 56-71, and 79 as shown on these plans and the approved Conceptual Grading and Development Plan for TM 5551.

**EASEMENT AVOIDANCE:** In order to protect sensitive resources, pursuant to [County Grading Ordinance Section 87.112](#) the open space easements shall be avoided. The easement indicated on this plan is for the protection of sensitive environmental resources and prohibits all of the following on any portion of the land subject to said easement: grading; excavation; placement of soil, sand, rock, gravel, or other material; clearing of vegetation; construction, erection, or placement of any building or structure; vehicular activities; trash dumping; or use for any purpose other than as open space. It is unlawful to grade or clear within an open space easement, any disturbance shall constitute a violation of the [County Grading Ordinance Section 87.112](#) and will result in enforcement action and restoration. The only exception to this prohibition is routine maintenance for the drainage storage ponds (existing and proposed). No motorized vehicles shall be used for the maintenance.

The GPU EIR imposed mitigation for these impacts. The Butterfield Ranch Project has imposed mitigation measures consistent with the GPU EIR that will be completed prior to approval of the Final Map or as a condition of the Major Use Permit.

### Conclusion

The project could result in potentially significant impacts to biological resources; however, further environmental analysis is not required because:

1. No peculiar impacts to the project or its site have been identified.
2. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which were not discussed by the GPU EIR.
3. No substantial new information has been identified which results in an impact which is more severe than anticipated by the GPU EIR.
4. Feasible mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR will be applied to the project.

### CULTURAL RESOURCES

The cultural resources report titled, "A Cultural Resources Survey and Evaluation Program for the Butterfield Trails Ranch Project, Valley Center, San Diego County, California", dated August 26, 2010, prepared by G. Timothy Gross and Mary Robbins-Wade of Affinis and edited and updated by Brian F. Smith of Brian F. Smith and Associates, Inc. provides the results of a cultural resource survey to determine the presence of cultural resources and test program to determine the significance and boundary of one site: CA-SDI-5812 (locus A and D), and the reestablishment of the boundaries of site CA-SDI-5811 both of which are partially located within the project footprint and partially offsite. Through data recovery, curation of artifacts, temporary fencing around the sites during grading, a grading monitoring program and site capping, these sites have been mitigated. Evaluation of three potentially significant historic structures (P-37-028083, P-37-028084 and P-37-028085) located within the project area of potential effect (APE) determined that these historic sites are not important resources.

The GP EIR analysis indicated there would be the potential for direct and/or indirect impacts to cultural resources from the development of land uses proposed under the GPU, including significant impacts to paleontological and archaeological resources from potential ground-disturbing activities associated with future development. General Plan Update policies and mitigation measures would reduce impacts to historic, archaeological, unique geological, paleontological, and to human remains but not to below a level of significance. The following impacts were anticipated in the GPU EIR Cultural Resources Chapter and mitigation measures were proposed:

	Significant Project Impact	Peculiar Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
<b>5. Cultural Resources – Would the Project:</b>			
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion

- 5(a) No. Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by County of San Diego approved archaeologist, Mary Robbins-Wade of Affinis in November 2006, it has been determined that there are two residences and one barn onsite that are over 50 years old. A cultural resources report titled, "*A Cultural Resources Survey and Evaluation Program for the Butterfield Trails Ranch Project*", prepared by Mary Robbins Wade of Affinis and then revised and edited by Brian F. Smith and Associates, Inc, evaluated the significance of the structures and determined that they were not significant pursuant to the State of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, Section 15064.5. Moreover, if the resources are not considered significant historic resources pursuant to CEQA Section 15064.5 loss of these resources cannot contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact.
- 5(b) **Yes. Significant Project Impact to Archaeological Resources.** The project site has been surveyed by a County approved archaeologist, Mary Robbins-Wade of Affinis in November 2006 and it has been determined that there are two archaeological resources present which also extend offsite. These resources include CA-SDI-5811 and CA-SDI-5812 (Locus A and D). A cultural resources study titled, "*A Cultural Resources Survey and Evaluation Program for the Butterfield Trails Ranch Project*", prepared by Mary Robbins Wade of Affinis and then revised and edited by Brian F. Smith and Associates, Inc evaluated the significance of the archaeological resources based on subsurface testing, analysis of recovered artifacts, and other investigations and has determined that CA-SDI-5812 Locus A and D and CA-SDI-5811 are significant pursuant to the State of

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, Section 15064.5. Locus A and D of CA-SDI-5812 will undergo a data recovery program and CA-SDI-5811 will undergo a capping program to minimize indirect impacts to the site. Portions of CA-SDI-5811 are currently located in an existing open space easement. The implementation of a data recovery program, capping of site CA-SDI-5811, curation of artifacts, temporary fencing around the existing open space easement during grading and grading monitoring program will mitigate both direct and indirect impacts to below a level of significance.

In addition, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) was contacted for a listing of Native American Tribes whose ancestral lands may be impacted by the project. The tribes listed by the NAHC were received and letters requesting tribal consultation were sent out on September 28, 2006. Shasta C. Gaughen from the Cupa Cultural Center stated that the Pala tribe has concerns that the project may uncover or disturb resources of cultural and historical significance. They requested further consultation on potential avoidance or mitigation and requested that a Native American monitor be onsite during any ground disturbing activities. The San Luis Rey Band of Mission Indians also stated that they are concerned about the protection of cultural resources and requested a Pre-Excavation Agreement for this project. In addition, SB-18 consultation occurred because of a General Plan Amendment being processed (a General Plan Amendment is no longer required on this project) on May 10, 2007 with County staff, the property owner, archaeological consultant and John Parada of the Rincon San Luiseno Band of Mission Indians. The GPU EIR identified these mitigation measures as EIR: Cul-1.1, Cul-2.5, Cul-2.6.

- 5(e) **Yes. Significant Project Impact to Human Remains.** Based on an analysis of records and archaeological surveys of the property, it has been determined that the project site could disturb human remains because a nearby property has known interred human remains and there is a site on the property that could contain human remains. The results of the survey are provided in a cultural resources survey report titled, "*A Cultural Resources Survey and Evaluation Program for the Butterfield Trails Ranch Project*", dated December 9, 2010, prepared by Mary Robbins Wade of Affinis and then revised and edited by Brian F. Smith and Associates. As outlined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, in the event that human remains are discovered during grading or construction of the project, the County will work with the appropriate Native Americans as identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 to ensure that all human remains will be appropriately treated or disposed of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any items associated with native American burials with the appropriate native Americans as identified by the NAHC.

The GPU EIR imposed the following mitigation for these cultural impacts (Cul-1.6, Cul-2-3, Cul-2-4, and Cul-2-5). The Butterfield Ranch Project will be implementing measures consistent with the GPU EIR mitigation measures:

Cul-1.1 is the utilization of regulations such as the Resource Protection Ordinance, CEQA Guidelines, the Grading and Clearing Ordinance, and the Zoning Ordinance to identify and protect important historic and archaeological resources. This will be accomplished by requiring appropriate reviews to identify historic resources and requiring avoidance or mitigation to when impacts are significant.

Cul-1.6 is the implementation, and update as necessary, of the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance for Cultural Resources. These guidelines apply to all

discretionary actions and require identification and minimization of adverse impacts to historic and archaeological resources.

Cul-2.3 requires County support of dedication of easements that protect important cultural resources through a variety of funding methods, such as grants or matching funds, or funds from private organizations. Such easements preserve cultural resources in their existing site locations and thus, help to minimize potential direct or indirect impacts.

Cul-2.4 is the on-going regional coordination and consultation with the NAHC and local tribal governments, including SB-18 review. These cooperative efforts ensure that significant sites are identified and preserved to the satisfaction of all parties.

Cul-2.5 requires grading monitoring by a qualified archaeologist and a Native American monitor during ground disturbing activities in the vicinity of known archaeological resources and during initial surveys. The use of monitors prevents direct impacts to archaeological resources.

The Butterfield Trails Ranch Cultural Resources Study utilized the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Cultural Resources consistent with GP MM-Cul-1.1 and will implement the following mitigation measures through completion of conditions of approval consistent with the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Cultural Resources (GP MM-Cul-1.2). The project mitigation includes:

**DATA RECOVERY PROGRAM:** In order to mitigate for potential impacts to significant cultural resources pursuant to Section 15064.5 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), which are not determined to be significant pursuant to Section 86.602.o of the Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO), a data recovery program shall be implemented. Implement the research design detailed in the archaeological extended study, "*A Cultural Resources Survey and Evaluation Program for the Butterfield Trails Ranch Project*" prepared by G. Timothy Smith and Mary Robbins-Wade of Affinis and Brian F. Smith of Brian F. Smith and Associates, dated December 9, 2010. The implementation of the research design constitutes mitigation for the proposed destruction of Archaeological site CA-SDI-5812 Locus A and D.

**ARTIFACT CURATION:** In order to ensure that all cultural resource artifacts that were discovered during the survey, testing and evaluation phase are curated for future research and study, the artifacts shall be curated in a County approved curation facility.

All archaeological materials recovered by G. Timothy Gross and Mary Robbins-Wade of Affinis and Brian F. Smith of Brian F. Smith and Associates during the work reported in: "*A cultural Resources Survey and Evaluation Program for the Butterfield Trails Ranch Project*" dated December 9, 2010, have been curated at a San Diego facility that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79, and therefore would be professionally curated and made available to other archaeologists/researchers for further study. The collections and associated records shall be transferred, including title, to an appropriate curation facility within San Diego County, to be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation.

**ARCHAEOLOGICAL GRADING MONITORING:** In order to mitigate for potential impacts to undiscovered buried archaeological resources on the project site, a grading monitoring program and potential data recovery program shall be implemented pursuant to the [County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance for Cultural Resources](#) and [CEQA Section 15064.5 and 15064.7](#). A County approved Principal Investigator (PI) known as the "Project Archaeologist," shall be contracted to perform

cultural resource grading monitoring and a potential data recovery program during all grading, clearing, grubbing, trenching, and construction activities.

**CULTURAL RESOURCES REPORT:** In order to ensure that the Grading Monitoring occurred during the grading phase of the project pursuant to condition 29 a final report shall be prepared and submitted. The final Grading Monitoring and Data Recovery Report shall document the results, analysis, and conclusions of all phases of the Archaeological Monitoring Program.

**ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE CAPPING:** In order to mitigate for potential impacts to site CA-SDI-5811, a site capping plan shall be implemented pursuant to the [County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance for Cultural Resources](#) and [CEQA Section 15064.5 and 15064.7](#). A County approved Principal Investigator (PI) known as the "Project Archaeologist," shall be contracted to prepare and implement a site-capping plan.

**ARCHAEOLOGICAL MONITORING:** In order to comply with Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program pursuant to 3100 5551 (TM), a Cultural Resource Grading Monitoring Program shall be implemented. The County approved 'Project Archaeologist,' Native American Monitor, and the PDS Permit Compliance Coordinator (PCC), shall attend the pre-construction meeting with the contractors to explain and coordinate the requirements of the grading monitoring program. The Project Archaeologist (and Native American Monitor, if contracted) shall monitor original cutting of previously undisturbed deposits in all areas identified for development including off-site improvements. The grading monitoring program shall comply with the County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements for Archeological and Historic Resources.

**OPEN SPACE SIGNAGE & FENCING:** Fencing and signage shall be installed along the open space boundary of lots(s) 11-19, 56-71, and 79 as shown on these plans and the approved Conceptual Grading and Development Plan for TM 5551.

**EASEMENT AVOIDANCE:** In order to protect sensitive resources, pursuant to [County Grading Ordinance Section 87.112](#) the open space easements shall be avoided. The easement indicated on this plan is for the protection of sensitive environmental resources and prohibits all of the following on any portion of the land subject to said easement: grading; excavation; placement of soil, sand, rock, gravel, or other material; clearing of vegetation; construction, erection, or placement of any building or structure; vehicular activities; trash dumping; or use for any purpose other than as open space. It is unlawful to grade or clear within an open space easement, any disturbance shall constitute a violation of the [County Grading Ordinance Section 87.112](#) and will result in enforcement action and restoration. The only exception to this prohibition is routine maintenance for the drainage storage ponds (existing and proposed). No motorized vehicles shall be used for the maintenance.

The GPU EIR imposed mitigation for this impact. The Butterfield Ranch Project has imposed mitigation measures consistent with the GPU EIR that will be completed prior to approval of the Final Map or as a condition of the Major Use Permit.

## Conclusion

The project could result in potentially significant impacts to cultural resources; however, further environmental analysis is not required because:

1. No peculiar impacts to the project or its site have been identified.

2. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which were not discussed by the GPU EIR.
3. No substantial new information has been identified which results in an impact which is more severe than anticipated by the GPU EIR.
4. Feasible mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR will be applied to the project.

(UNIQUE GEOLOGY)

- 5(c) No. The site does not contain any unique geologic features that have been listed in the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance for Unique Geology Resources nor does the site support any known geologic characteristics that have the potential to support unique geologic features. While the GP EIR analysis indicated there would be the potential for direct and/or indirect impacts to unique geologic features this would not be applicable to the project.

(PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES)

- 5(d) **Yes. Significant Project Impact to Paleontological Resources.** A review of the County's Paleontological Resources Maps and data on San Diego County's geologic formations indicates that the project is located on geological formations Quaternary Alluvium that potentially contain unique paleontological resources. Proposed grading would include more than 2,500 cubic yards of excavation which has the potential to impact fossil deposits.

As considered by the GPU EIR, potential impacts to paleontological resources will be mitigated through ordinance compliance and through implementation of the following mitigation measures: grading monitoring under the supervision of a County-approved paleontologist and conformance with the County's Paleontological Resource Guidelines if resources are encountered. The GPU EIR identified these mitigation measures as Cul-3.1, The GPU EIR imposed the following mitigation for this impact. The Butterfield Ranch Project will be implementing a mitigation measure consistent with the GPU EIR mitigation measures prior to approval of the Final Map or as a condition of the Major Use Permit.

The GPU EIR imposed the following mitigation for this paleontological impacts (Cul-3.1 and Cul-3.2). The Butterfield Ranch Project will be implementing measures consistent with the GPU EIR mitigation measures.

Cul-3.1 implements the County Grading Ordinance and CEQA guidelines which require a paleontological resources monitor during grading when appropriate, to avoid or minimize impacts to resources, and to apply appropriate mitigation when impacts are significant (e.g., salvage, curation, data collection, etc.). These measures would prevent significant losses of unique paleontological resources.

Cul-3.2 requires the County to implement, and update as necessary, the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance for Paleontological Resources to identify and minimize adverse impacts to paleontological resources. These guidelines apply to discretionary actions and development projects under the project and result in identification of resources and avoid or mitigate significant impacts.

County staff analyzed the project consistent with the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Paleontological Resources (Cul-3.2) and will implement the following mitigation measure consistent with Cul-3.1:

**PALEONTOLOGICAL MONITORING:** In order to comply with the [County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements for Paleontological Resources](#), a Grading Monitoring Program shall be implemented. If no paleontological resources were discovered, submit a “No Fossils Found” letter from the grading contractor to the County stating that the monitoring has been completed and that no fossils were discovered, and including the names and signatures from the fossil monitors. If Paleontological resources were encountered during grading, a letter shall be prepared, stating that the field grading monitoring activities have been completed, and that resources have been encountered. The letter shall detail the anticipated time schedule for completion of the curation phase of the monitoring with documentation in accordance with the County Requirements.

The GPU EIR imposed mitigation for all the cultural resource impacts. The Butterfield Ranch Project has imposed mitigation measures consistent with the GPU EIR that will be completed prior to approval of the Final Map or as a condition of the Major Use Permit.

### **Conclusion**

The project could result in potentially significant impacts to cultural resources; however, further environmental analysis is not required because:

1. No peculiar impacts to the project or its site have been identified.
2. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which were not discussed by the GPU EIR.
3. No substantial new information has been identified which results in an impact which is more severe than anticipated by the GPU EIR.
4. Feasible mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR will be applied to the project.

### **GEOLOGY AND SOILS**

The project site is within the historic floodplain of Moosa Creek and therefore the soils may contain unconsolidated materials. The GPU EIR determined there was a potential to result in impacts from geology and soils during development of land uses proposed under the GPU, but direct and cumulative impacts were found to be less than significant. Future development under the General Plan Update would be required to comply with State and local building standards and regulations, including the California Building Code and County-required geotechnical reconnaissance reports and investigations. Compliance with such regulations would reduce impacts associated with on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse to a less than significant level. This information was anticipated in the GPU EIR Geology and Soils Chapter and it was applicable to the Butterfield Trails Ranch project.

	Significant Project Impact	Peculiar Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
<b>6. Geology and Soils – Would the Project:</b>			
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, liquefaction, and/or landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in an on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion

6(a)(i) No: Less than Significant with incorporation of Design Measures. The project is not located in a fault rupture hazard zone identified by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997, Fault-Rupture Hazards Zones in California, or located within any other area with substantial evidence of a known fault. The project site is located within an historic floodplain and a geotechnical study during grading of the site shall be done to make recommendations and to implement engineering solutions to ensure stability of the building foundations.

6(a)(ii) No. To ensure the structural integrity of all buildings and structures, the project must conform to the Seismic Requirements as outlined within the California Building Code. Compliance with the California Building Code and the County Building Code will ensure that the project will not result in a significant impact.

6(a)(iii) No: Less than Significant with incorporation of Design Measures. The County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards indicate that because the site is located within an historic floodplain, a geotechnical study during grading of the site shall be done to make recommendations and to implement engineering solutions to ensure stability of the building foundations.

6(a)(iv) No. The site is not located within a "Landslide Susceptibility Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards.

6(b) No. According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as Fallbrook and Visalia Sandy Loams which have a high soil erodibility rating. However, the



project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil because the project will be required to comply with the Watershed Protection Ordinance (WPO) and Grading Ordinance which will ensure that the project would not result in any unprotected erodible soils, will not alter existing drainage patterns, and will not develop steep slopes. Additionally, the project will be required to implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) to prevent fugitive sediment.

- 6(c) No. The project is not located on or near geological formations that are unstable or would potentially become unstable as a result of the project.
- 6(d) No. The project is not underlain by expansive soils as defined within Table 18-I-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994). The project will not result in a significant impact because compliance with the Building Code and implementation of standard engineering techniques will ensure structural safety.
- 6(e) No. The project will rely on public water and sewer for the disposal of wastewater. No septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems are proposed.

The following design measure has been included in the Butterfield Trails Ranch project:

**GEOTECHNICAL STUDIES:** In order to identify that the project site is subject to Liquefaction as evaluated by the [County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance](#), Geotechnical Report shall be prepared by a Registered Civil or Geotechnical Engineer, and submitted for approval by the by the County. The report shall specify foundation designs, which are adequate to preclude substantial damage to the proposed structure due to liquefaction. The applicant shall prepare the report and submit it along with the submittal for the building plans. All recommendations of the report shall be incorporated into the design of the building.

## Conclusion

Consistent with the GPU EIR, the project would not result in any significant impacts to/from geology/soils; The project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

## GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

The project would produce GHG emissions through construction activities, vehicle trips, and residential fuel combustion; however, the project would not generate more than the 900 metric ton threshold established by the California Air Pollution Control Officer's Association (CAPCOA) white paper. Climate change is a global phenomenon which is cumulative by nature, as it is the result of combined worldwide contributions of GHG to the atmosphere over many years. Therefore, significant direct impacts associated with the climate change also serve as the cumulative impact discussion.

The GP EIR analysis indicated there would be the potential for direct and/or cumulative impacts to global climate change from the development of land uses proposed under the GPU. The proposed General Plan policies and mitigation measures, in addition to compliance with applicable regulations such as the CAA, Lieberman-Warner Climate Security Act, CARB standards, Title 24 standards, Executive Order S-3-05, AB 32, Executive Order S-01-07, SB 97, SB 1368, SB 1078, APCD standards and existing County programs and policies, would mitigate the potential direct and cumulative impacts of global climate change to a level below significant.

The GPU EIR identifies significant impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions and the ability to meet the goals and strategies of AB 32. Potential impacts were anticipated in the GPU EIR Global Climate Change Chapter and mitigation measures were proposed.

	Significant Project Impact	Peculiar Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
<b>7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions – Would the Project:</b>			
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion

- 7(a) No. The project would produce GHG emissions through construction activities, vehicle trips, and residential fuel combustion; however, the project would not generate more than the 900 metric ton threshold established by the California Air Pollution Control Officer's Association (CAPCOA) white paper. Furthermore, projects that generate less than 900 metric tons of GHG will also participate in emission reductions because air emissions including GHGs are regulated either by the California Air Resources Control Board (CARB) the Federal Government, or other entities.
- 7(b) No: Less than Significant with incorporation of Design Measures. The County of San Diego is currently in the process of developing a Climate Action Plan which will provide direction for individual project to reduce GHG emissions and help the County meet its GHG emission reduction targets. CARB is in the process of developing regulations to implement the 33% standard known as the California Renewable Electricity Standard. Until local plans are adopted to address greenhouse gas emissions, the project is evaluated to determine whether it would impede the implementation of AB 32 GHG reduction targets. For the reasons discussed in the response to question 7(a) above, the project would not impede the implementation of AB 32 reduction targets and it would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.

The Global Climate Change Study for Butterfield Trails Ranch utilized the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Climate Change. The study concluded that with incorporation of the design features, significant impacts would not occur. The design measures will be implemented through completion of conditions of approval:

**CLIMATE CHANGE:** In order to appropriately reduce long-term GHG emissions, design measures shall be incorporated into site plans to achieve the objectives of AB 32. Implementing Building Plans shall include design measures to reduce long-term, operational GHG emissions by 33% below "business as usual". The Building Plans shall incorporate EPA's Energy Star Compliance guidelines (Effective Insulation Systems, High-Performance Windows, Tight Construction and Ducts, Efficient Heating and Cooling Equipment, Energy Star Qualified Lighting and Appliances). In addition, 100 square feet of solar production on average on each lot shall be provided.

The GPU EIR imposed mitigation measures for this impact. The Butterfield Ranch Project has included design features consistent with the GPU EIR that will be completed prior to approval of the Final Map or as a condition of the Major Use Permit.

### Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to greenhouse gas emissions; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

## HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

The GP EIR analysis indicated there would be the potential for direct and cumulative impacts to humans from hazards with development of land uses proposed under the GPU. The project site was farmed in the 1940s and has a large pond and five buildings from that era. These structures all have potential for contamination from hazardous materials or vectors including lead, asbestos, and petroleum contamination. The soils also may require remediation from past agricultural use. However, future development under the General Plan Update would be required to comply with federal, State and local standards and regulations, and all potential impacts have been reduced to less than significant, consistent with the GP EIR.

General Plan Update policies and mitigation measures would reduce impacts from hazardous materials and vectors to less than significant. These impacts were anticipated in the GPU EIR Hazards Chapter and mitigation measures were proposed. The mitigation resulted in a less than significant impact associated with existing hazardous materials.

The GP EIR identifies significant impacts associated with exposure of people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands. The General Plan Update policies and mitigation measures would reduce impacts from wildland fire but not to below a level of significance. The following impacts were anticipated in the GPU EIR Hazards and Hazardous Materials Chapter and mitigation measures were proposed.

	Significant Project Impact	Peculiar Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
<b>8. Hazards and Hazardous Materials – Would the Project:</b>			
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or wastes or through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Government Code Section 65962.5, or is otherwise known to have been subject to a release of hazardous substances and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

d) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

☐ ☐ ☐

e) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

☐ ☐ ☐

f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

☐ ☐ ☐

g) Propose a use, or place residents adjacent to an existing or reasonably foreseeable use that would substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies, which are capable of transmitting significant public health diseases or nuisances?

☐ ☐ ☐

### Discussion

8(a) No: Less than Significant with incorporation of Design Measures. The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because it does not propose the storage, use, transport, or emission of Hazardous Substances, nor are Hazardous Substances proposed or currently in use in the immediate vicinity. The project does require demolition of existing structures onsite which could produce a hazard related to the release of asbestos, lead based paint or other hazardous materials. Specific design measures have been incorporated to ensure compliance with health codes and regulations.

8(b) No. The project is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.

8(c) No. Based on a site visit and a comprehensive review of regulatory databases (see attached Hazards/Hazardous Materials references), the project site has not been subject to a release of hazardous substances. Additionally, the project does not propose structures for human occupancy or significant linear excavation within 1,000 feet of an open, abandoned, or closed landfill, is not located on or within 250 feet of the boundary of a parcel identified as containing burn ash (from the historic burning of trash), and is not on or within 1,000 feet of a Formerly Used Defense Site.

8(d) No. The proposed project is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP), an Airport Influence Area, or a Federal Aviation Administration Height Notification Surface. Also, the project does not propose construction of any structure equal to or greater than 150 feet in height, constituting a safety hazard to aircraft and/or operations from an airport or heliport.

- 8(e) No. The proposed project is not within one mile of a private airstrip.
- 8(f)(i) No. OPERATIONAL AREA EMERGENCY PLAN AND MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN: The project will not interfere with this plan because it will not prohibit subsequent plans from being established or prevent the goals and objectives of existing plans from being carried out.
- 8(f)(ii) No. SAN DIEGO COUNTY NUCLEAR POWER STATION EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN: The property is not within the San Onofre emergency planning zone.
- 8(f)(iii) No. OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY ELEMENT: The project is not located along the coastal zone.
- 8f)(iv) No. EMERGENCY WATER CONTINGENCIES ANNEX AND ENERGY SHORTAGE RESPONSE PLAN: The project would not alter major water or energy supply infrastructure which could interfere with the plan.
- 8(f)(v) No. DAM EVACUATION PLAN: The project is not located within a dam inundation zone.
- 8(g) No: Less than Significant with incorporation of Design Measures. The proposed project is adjacent to wildlands that have the potential to support wildland fires. However, the project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires because the project will comply with the regulations relating to emergency access, water supply, and defensible space specified in the Consolidated Fire Code, as described in the approved Fire Protection Plan prepared for the project by Scott Franklin Consulting, (February 14, 2011). Also, a Fire Service Availability Letter dated February 3, 2011 has been received from the Valley Center Fire Protection District which indicates the expected emergency travel time to the project site to be two minutes which is adequate for Rural Residential zoning and within the 5 minute maximum travel time allowed by the County Public Safety Element.
- 8(h) No: Less than Significant with incorporation of Design Measures. The project includes an existing artificial pond that allows water to stand for a period of 72 hours or more. This artificial pond will be regulated by the conditions of approval related to "drainage improvements" in compliance with the [County Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance \(Title 8, Division 11\)](#) and the [County Watershed Protection Ordinance \(WPO\) No.9926, County Code Section 67.801 et. seq.](#) However, the project does not involve or support uses that will produce or collect animal waste, such as equestrian facilities, agricultural operations (chicken coops, dairies etc.), solid waste facility or other similar uses.

The GPU EIR imposed the following mitigation for these impacts. The design measures for the Butterfield Trails Ranch project are consistent with the GPU EIR, and have been implemented through the conditions of approval. GPU EIR M-Haz-4.1 through Haz-4.5 include minimizing the potential fire hazards for the development by adhering to the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Wildland Fires & Fire Protection, requiring the project to implement the Fire Protection Plan, Weed Abatement Ordinance, defensible space around structures; coordination with the local fire authority having jurisdiction to ensure that district goals for fuel management and fire protection are being met; complying with Building and Fire Code to ensure there are adequate fire service levels; and require site and/or building designs that incorporate features that reduce fire hazards; and facilitating conservation-oriented, fire-safe, project design with improved fire protection.

The following design measures have been included in the Butterfield Trails Ranch project:

**STRUCTURE REMOVAL:** In order to comply with [County Zoning Ordinance Section 4800](#), the structures on site shall be removed, relocated onsite, or demolished (except for the structure known as the barn). A Demolition Permit shall be obtained from the *[PDS Building Division]*. Compliance with conditions to determine the presence or absence of Lead Based Paints and or Asbestos shall be completed before any demolition permit can be issued.

**LEAD SURVEY:** In order to avoid hazards associated with lead based paint (LBP) and to reduce the hazard as established in the [County of San Diego Hazardous Materials and Existing Contamination Guidelines for Determining Significance](#), the structures on site shall be surveyed for the presence of LBP because the structures were built prior to 1980. A survey shall be performed before the removal or demolition of the residences by a California Department of Health Services (DHS) certified lead inspector/risk assessor. All lead containing materials shall be managed in accordance with applicable regulations including, at a minimum, the hazardous waste disposal requirements (Title 22 California Code of Regulations [CCR] Division 4.5), the worker health and safety requirements (Title 8 California Code of Regulations Section 1532.1), and the State Lead Accreditation, Certification, and Work Practice Requirements (Title 17 CCR Division 1, Chapter 8). All lead containing materials scheduled for demolition must comply with applicable regulations for demolition methods and dust suppression.

**ASBESTOS SURVEY:** In order to avoid hazards associated with Asbestos Containing Materials (ACMs) because the structures were built prior to 1980, and to reduce the hazard as established by the [County of San Diego Hazardous Materials and Existing Contamination Guidelines for Determining Significance](#), the structure(s) on site shall be surveyed for ACMs. A facility survey shall be performed to determine the presence or absence of Asbestos Containing Materials (ACMs) in the existing onsite residences. The survey shall be conducted by a person certified by Cal/OSHA pursuant to regulations implementing subdivision (b) of Section 9021.5 of the Labor Code, and shall have taken and passed an EPA-approved Building Inspector Course. If ACMs are found present, they shall be handled and remediated in compliance with the San Diego County Air Pollution Control District Rule 361.145 – Standard for Demolition and Renovation.

**ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT:** In order to comply with the County of San Diego Hazardous Materials and Existing Contamination Guidelines for Determining Significance, an Environmental Site Assessment shall be completed. A signed, stamped Limited Phase II Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) shall be prepared by a Registered Engineer or Professional Geologist. These assessments shall include shallow soil sampling between six inches to 2-3 feet in depth, in areas of the site where future exposure is likely to occur (such as around proposed house pads), and in the areas of the site with the highest likelihood for contamination, such as around chemical/ pesticide/ fuel storage and mixing areas and among agricultural crops. The ESA should identify whether onsite soils exceed regulatory screening levels for pesticides, petroleum, heavy metals, or other contaminants. If contaminated soils are detected, provide a letter from DEH stating that a VAP work plan has been prepared and approved to remediate contaminated soils in accordance with existing regulations. If contaminated soils are detected, provide a copy of the contract and a signed sealed statement from the Registered Engineer or Professional Geologist, which states that they will implement the VAP work plan. Grading required to implement the site remediation activities is permitted and shall be fully incorporated into the Grading Plans.

**DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS :** In order to comply with the [County Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance \(Title 8, Division 11\)](#), [County Watershed Protection Ordinance \(WPO\) No.9926](#), [County Code Section 67.801 et. seq.](#), and the [County Resource Protection Ordinance \(RPO\) No. 9842](#), drainage improvements shall be completed, including improvement of the existing storage pond and its spillway to be designed per applicable standards, improvement of the berm structure along the northerly boundary of lot 50 through 54, improvement of the HMP basins and levee adjacent/within along Moosa Creek, and other onsite drainage systems.

***Approval of the final project design may be affected by the analysis and approval of the drainage facilities above if required the project may be required to be revised in which case a revised map would be filed.***

All drainage plan improvements shall be prepared and completed pursuant to the following ordinances and standards: San Diego County Drainage Design Manual, San Diego County Hydrology Manual, County of San Diego Grading Ordinance, Zoning Ordinance Sections 5300 through 5500, County Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO) No. 9842, and County Flood Damage Protection Ordinance (Title 8, Division 11).

**FIRE AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES:** In order to assure long-term availability of adequate fire and emergency medical service for the project site, the property shall be annexed into a Community Facilities District (CFD) or participate in an equivalent funding mechanism established to fund the perpetual operation of fire and emergency services in Valley Center.

The GPU EIR imposed mitigation for this impact. The Butterfield Ranch Project has also imposed measures consistent with the GPU EIR that will be completed prior to approval of the Final Map or as a condition of the Major Use Permit.

### **Conclusion**

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to/from hazards/hazardous materials; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

### **HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY**

The GP EIR analysis indicated there would be the potential for direct and cumulative impacts from hydrological changes and to water quality associated with development of land uses proposed under the GPU. General Plan Update policies and mitigation measures would reduce impacts but not to below a level of significance. The following impacts were anticipated in the GPU EIR Hydrology and Water Quality Chapter and mitigation measures were proposed:

	<b>Significant Project Impact</b>	<b>Peculiar Impact not identified by GPU EIR</b>	<b>Substantial New Information</b>
<b>9. Hydrology and Water Quality – Would the Project:</b>			
a) Violate any waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Is the project tributary to an already impaired water	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list?  
If so, could the project result in an increase in any pollutant for which the water body is already impaired?

c) Could the proposed project cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses?

☐ ☐ ☐

d) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

☐ ☐ ☐

e) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

☐ ☐ ☐

f) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

☐ ☐ ☐

g) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems?

☐ ☐ ☐

i) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, including County Floodplain Maps?

☐ ☐ ☐

j) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

☐ ☐ ☐

k) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding?

☐ ☐ ☐

l) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

☐ ☐ ☐

m) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

☐ ☐ ☐

n) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation

☐ ☐ ☐



map, including County Floodplain Maps?

o) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

☐ ☐ ☐

p) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding?

☐ ☐ ☐

### Discussion

- 9(a) No. The project will require a NPDES General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activities. The project applicant has provided a Stormwater Management Plan (SWMP) which demonstrates that the project will comply with all requirements of the WPO. The project will be required to implement site design measures, source control BMPs, and/or treatment control BMPs to reduce potential pollutants to the maximum extent practicable. These measures will enable the project to meet waste discharge requirements as required by the San Diego Municipal Permit, as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP).
- 9(b) No. The project lies in the Valley Center hydrologic subarea, within the San Luis Rey hydrologic unit. According to the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list, a portion of this watershed is impaired for Chloride, TDS, and Indicator Bacteria. Constituents of concern in the San Luis Rey watershed include coliform bacteria, nutrients, sediment, lowered dissolve oxygen, and trace metals. The project could contribute to release of these pollutants; however, the project will comply with the WPO and implement site design measures, source control BMPs, and treatment control BMPs to prevent a significant increase of pollutants to receiving waters.
- 9(c) No. As stated in responses 9(a) and 9(b) above, implementation of BMPs and compliance with required ordinances will ensure that project impacts are less than significant.
- 9(d) No. The project will obtain its water supply from the Valley Center Municipal Water District that obtains water from surface reservoirs or other imported sources. The project will not use any groundwater. In addition, the project does not involve operations that would interfere substantially with groundwater recharge.
- 9(e) No. The project proposes a major subdivision within the watercourse that would alter the floodplain. As outlined in the Storm water Management Plan (SWMP) dated December 10, 2010 and prepared by Tory R. Walker Engineering, Inc., the project will implement the following site design measures, source control, and/or treatment control BMP's to reduce potential pollutants, including sediment from erosion or siltation, to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff: Bioretention areas, Clearwater Solution BMPs, Tree-pit-style units, HMP ponds and rip-rap. These measures will control erosion and sedimentation and satisfy waste discharge requirements as required by the Land-Use Planning for New Development and Redevelopment Component of the San Diego Municipal Permit (SDRWQCB Order No. R9-2007-0001), as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP). The SWMP specifies and describes the implementation process of all BMP's that will address equipment operation and materials

management, prevent the erosion process from occurring, and prevent sedimentation in any onsite and downstream drainage swales. The Department of Planning & Development Services will ensure that the Plan is implemented as proposed. The project engineer will analyze the erosion and /or sedimentation potential and the project will be required to incorporate mitigation that will not result in the alteration of any drainage patterns of the site or area on- or off-site.

Based on a CEQA Drainage Study prepared by Tory R. Walker Engineering, Inc., dated August 31, 2010, the project site lies within the FEMA Special Flood Zone A as indicated on FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) map panels #06073C0810G and #06073C0809G and will impact the current floodplain boundaries on Moosa Canyon Creek. Therefore, a CLOMR/LOMR will be required per County Ordinance Section 811.503(b), and National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) regulations where there are changes proposed to the mapped FEMA floodplain.

The project will be required to submit a HEC-RAS model for approval during the final engineering review. If the final HEC-RAS study determines that revisions to the project design and/or lot configuration are required, a revised map will be submitted for County processing.

- 9(f) No. The project will be required to submit a detailed final Drainage study which will include a HEC-RAS model for approval during the final engineering review. The drainage study will analyze the course of a stream or river for pre-development and post-development. The project will be required to incorporate mitigation that will demonstrate that the resulting design will not significantly alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site. If the final studies determine that revisions to the project design are required, a revised map will be submitted for county processing.

Based on a CEQA Drainage Study prepared by Tory R. Walker Engineering, Inc., dated August 31, 2010, the project site partially lies within Zone A, and partially lies within Zone X, as indicated on FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) map panels #06073C0810G and #06073C0809G and will impact the current floodplain boundaries on Moosa Canyon Creek. Therefore, a CLOMR/LOMR will be required per County Ordinance Section 811.503(b), and National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) regulations where there are changes proposed to the mapped FEMA floodplain.

- 9(g) No. The project will be required to submit a detailed final Drainage study which will include a HEC-RAS model for approval during the final engineering review. The drainage study will analyze the existing and planned storm water drainage systems for pre-development and post-development. The project will be required to incorporate mitigation that will not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems. If the final studies determine that revisions to the project design are required, a revised map will be submitted for County processing.

A CEQA Drainage Study dated August 31, 2010 prepared by Tory R. Walker Engineering, Inc., was completed for the proposed project. The CEQA Drainage Study identified that the proposed project will result in an increase of 37 cfs in runoff. The project will implement the following site design measures, source control, and/or treatment control BMP's to reduce potential pollutants, including sediment from erosion or

siltation and runoff, to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff: bioretentions, and HMP basins. The project site partially lies within Zone A, and partially lies within Zone X, as indicated on FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) map panels #06073C0810G and #06073C0809G and will impact the current floodplain boundaries on Moosa Canyon Creek. Therefore, a CLOMR/LOMR will be required per County Ordinance Section 811.503(b), and National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) regulations where there are changes proposed to the mapped FEMA floodplain.

- 9(h) No. The project has the potential to generate pollutants; however, site design measures, source control BMPs, and treatment control BMPs will be employed such that potential pollutants will be reduced to the maximum extent practicable.
- 9(i) No. The FEMA mapped floodplain and County-mapped floodplain for Moosa Creek was identified on the project site. Because conditions of approval require that all structures be one foot above the FEMA base flood depth, the proposed housing will not be subject to the 100-year flood hazard.

The project will be required to submit a detailed final Drainage study which will include a HEC-RAS model for approval during the final engineering review. The drainage study will analyze the course of a stream or river for pre-development and post-development. The project will be required to incorporate mitigation that will demonstrate that the resulting design will not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as revised map on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, including County Floodplain Maps. If the final studies determine that revisions to the project design are required, a revised map will be submitted for County processing.

Based on a CEQA Drainage Study prepared by Tory R. Walker Engineering, Inc., dated August 31, 2010, the project site partially lies within Zone A, and partially lies within Zone X, as indicated on FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) map panels #06073C0810G and #06073C0809G and will impact the current floodplain boundaries on Moosa Canyon Creek. Therefore, a CLOMR/LOMR will be required per County Ordinance Section 811.503(b), and National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) regulations where there are changes proposed to the mapped FEMA floodplain.

The project is also required to certify that any construction, substantial improvement and placement of any structure in FEMA Flood Zone or FIRM, shall have the lowest floor, including basement, mechanical and utility equipment, and ductwork, but excluding garages used solely for parking or storing vehicles, access to or from the structure or storage in a manner that prevents stored objects from being carried away in a flood, elevated at least 1 foot above the base flood depth. The elevation shall be certified by a registered civil engineer or licensed land surveyor. Such certification and verification shall be provided to the Flood Plain Administrator.

- 9(j) No. The project will be required to submit a detailed final Drainage study which will include a HEC-RAS model for approval during the final engineering review. The drainage study will analyze the course of a stream or river for pre-development and post-development. The project will be required to incorporate mitigation that will demonstrate that the resulting design will not place structures within a 100-year flood hazard area which would impede or redirect flood flows. If the final studies determine that revisions to the project design are required, a revised map will be submitted for County processing.

Drainage swales, which are mapped on a FEMA floodplain map, a County Floodplain Map or have a watershed greater than 25 acres were identified on the project site. Based on a CEQA Drainage Study prepared by Tory R. Walker Engineering, Inc., dated August 31, 2010, the project site partially lies within Zone A, partially lies within Zone X, as indicated on FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) map panels #06073C0810G and #06073C0809G and will impact the current floodplain boundaries on Moosa Canyon Creek. Therefore, a CLOMR/LOMR will be required per County Ordinance Section 811.503(b), and National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) regulations where there are changes proposed to the mapped FEMA floodplain.

The project is also required to certify that any construction, substantial improvement and placement of any structure in FEMA Flood Zone or FIRM, shall have the lowest floor, including basement, mechanical and utility equipment, and ductwork, but excluding garages used solely for parking or storing vehicles, access to or from the structure or storage in a manner that prevents stored objects from being carried away in a flood, elevated at least 1 foot above the base flood depth. The elevation shall be certified by a registered civil engineer or licensed land surveyor. Such certification and verification shall be provided to the Flood Plain Administrator.

- 9(k) No. The project will be required to submit a detailed final Drainage study which will include a HEC-RAS model for approval during the final engineering review. The drainage study will analyze the course of a stream or river for pre-development and post-development. The project will be required to incorporate mitigation that will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding. If the final studies determine that revisions to the project design are required, a revised map will be submitted for County processing.

Based on a CEQA Drainage Study prepared by Tory R. Walker Engineering, Inc., dated August 31, 2010, the project site partially lies within Zone A, partially lies within Zone X, as indicated on FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) map panels #06073C0810G and #06073C0809G and will impact the current floodplain boundaries on Moosa Canyon Creek. Therefore, a CLOMR/LOMR will be required per County Ordinance Section 811.503(b), and National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) regulations where there are changes proposed to the mapped FEMA floodplain. All the onsite dam and levees will be designed and constructed to the satisfaction of Director of Planning & Development Services and FEMA.

The project is also required to certify that any construction, substantial improvement and placement of any structure in FEMA Flood Zone or FIRM, shall have the lowest floor, including basement, mechanical and utility equipment, and ductwork, but excluding garages used solely for parking or storing vehicles, access to or from the structure or storage in a manner that prevents stored objects from being carried away in a flood, elevated at least 1 foot above the base flood depth. The elevation shall be certified by a registered civil engineer or licensed land surveyor. Such certification and verification shall be provided to the Flood Plain Administrator.

- 9(l) No. The project site lies outside a mapped dam inundation area for a major dam/reservoir within San Diego County. In addition, the project is not located immediately downstream of a minor dam that could potentially flood the property.
- 9(n) No. SEICHE: The project site is not located along the shoreline of a lake or reservoir.

9(o) No. TSUNAMI: The project site is not located in a tsunami hazard zone.

9(p) No. MUDFLOW: Mudflow is type of landslide. See response to question 6(a)(iv).

The following design measure has been included in the Butterfield Trails Ranch project:

**FLOODPLAIN COMPLIANCE** In order to provide protection from flood damage for the structure from flows coming from Moosa Canyon Creek and to comply with the [County Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance \(Title 8, Division 11 Sec 501 \(c\)\(1\)\)](#), [County Watershed Protection Ordinance \(WPO\) No.10096](#), [County Code Section 67.801 et. seq.](#), all structures on-site shall be elevated one foot above the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) base flood depth. The project site is located within the FEMA Special Flood Zone A as indicated on FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) map panels #06073C0810G and #06073C0809G and will impact the current floodplain boundaries on Moosa Canyon Creek; therefore, any change to the base flood depths or floodplain boundary including those caused by the placement of fill or other construction would require a Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLOMR) and subsequent Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) from FEMA in accordance with the [County Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance \(Title 8, Division 11 Sec 503 \(b\)\)](#).

The GPU EIR imposed mitigation for this impact. The Butterfield Ranch Project has imposed this measure consistent with the GPU EIR that will be completed prior to approval of the Final Map or as a condition of the Major Use Permit.

### Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to/from hydrology/water quality; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

## LAND USE AND PLANNING

The GP EIR analysis indicated there would be the potential for direct and cumulative impacts from land use and planning associated with development under the GPU. General Plan Update policies and mitigation measures reduce impacts to below a level of significance. The following impacts were anticipated in the GPU EIR Land Use and Planning Resources Chapter and mitigation measures were proposed.

	Significant Project Impact	Peculiar Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
<b>10. Land Use and Planning – Would the Project:</b>			
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion**

10(a) No. The project does not propose the introduction of new infrastructure such as major roadways, water supply systems, or utilities to the area.

10(b) No. The project would not conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect, including policies of the General Plan and Community Plan.

**Conclusion**

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to land use/planning; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

**MINERAL RESOURCES**

The GP EIR analysis indicated there would be the potential for direct and cumulative impacts to mineral resources from development of land uses proposed under the GPU. General Plan Update policies and mitigation measures would reduce impacts but not to below a level of significance. The following impacts were anticipated in the GPU EIR Mineral Resources Chapter and mitigation measures were proposed. However, the project does not have mineral resource impacts, and the GPU EIR determination that there is the potential to significantly impact mineral resources from the development of land uses proposed under the GPU is not applicable to the project.

	Significant Project Impact	Peculiar Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
<b>11. Mineral Resources – Would the Project:</b>			
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion**

11(a) No. The project site has been classified by the California Department of Conservation – Division of Mines and Geology as inconclusive (MRZ-4) and resources potentially present (MRZ-3). However, the project site is surrounded by a golf course and a residential community which are incompatible to future extraction of mineral resources on the project site. A future mining operation at the project site would likely create a significant impact to neighboring properties for issues such as noise, air quality, traffic, and possibly other impacts. Therefore, the project will not result in the loss of a known mineral resource because the resource has already been lost due to incompatible land uses.

11(b) No. The project site is not located in an Extractive Use Zone (S-82), nor does it have an Impact Sensitive Land Use Designation (24) with an Extractive Land Use Overlay (25).

## Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to mineral resources; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

## NOISE

The GP EIR analysis indicated there would be the potential for direct and cumulative impacts from noise associated with development of land uses proposed under the GPU. General Plan Update policies and mitigation measures would reduce impacts but not to below a level of significance. Impacts were anticipated in the GPU EIR Noise Chapter and mitigation measures were proposed.

	Significant Project Impact	Peculiar Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
<b>12. Noise – Would the Project:</b>			
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Discussion

**12(a) Yes. Significant Project Impact from Generation of Noise in Excess of Standards.** The project could result in noise impacts to future residents from adjacent roadways, but ordinances and regulations would reduce the impact to less than significant. Based on a Noise Analysis prepared by Ldn Consulting dated February 21, 2012, incorporation of a Noise Restriction Easement on Lots 1 and 2 would ensure the project would not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego

General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable standards for the following reasons:

#### **General Plan – Noise Element**

The County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element, Policy 4b addresses noise sensitive areas and requires an acoustical study to be prepared for any use that may expose noise sensitive area to noise in excess of a Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) of 60 decibels (dBA). Moreover, if the project is excess of CNEL 60 dB(A), modifications must be made to project to reduce noise levels. Noise sensitive areas include residences, hospitals, schools, libraries or similar facilities where quiet is an important attribute. Based on a Noise Analysis prepared by Ldn Consulting dated February 21, 2012, project implementation will not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to road, airport, heliport, railroad, industrial or other noise in excess of the CNEL 60 dB(A).

Noise sources to impact the project subdivision is primarily from future traffic traveling on Valley Center Road. Based on the noise report, the proposed residential lots (NSLU) would be exposed to future traffic noise levels below the 60 dBA CNEL at ground level receptors. All proposed ground level receptors would be below the 60 dBA requirement. Second story future traffic noise contours shows that portions of the project subdivision would experience noise levels exceeding 60 dBA CNEL at Lots 1 and 2. Per the County Noise Element, interior habitable living areas are subject to an interior noise requirement of 45 dBA. To ensure interior noise levels comply with this requirement, the project would dedicate a noise restriction easement to require an interior noise analysis at the time building plans are available for Lots 1 and 2. Therefore, with the Noise Restriction Easement dedication, the project would not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element.

#### **Noise Ordinance – Section 36.404**

Based on a Noise Analysis prepared by Ldn Consulting dated February 21, 2012 and project review by County Noise Specialist Emmet Aquino on February 14, 2012, non-transportation noise generated by the project is not expected to exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.404) at or beyond the project's property line. The site is zoned Rural Residential (RR) that has a one-hour average daytime sound limit of 45 dBA. It is anticipated that project's noise levels at the adjoining properties would not exceed County Noise Standards.

#### **Noise Ordinance – Section 36.409**

Based on a Noise Analysis prepared by Ldn Consulting dated February 21, 2012 the project will not generate construction noise that may exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.409). Construction operations will occur only during permitted hours of operation pursuant to Section 36.409. Also, it is not anticipated that the project will operate construction equipment in excess of an average sound level of 75dB between the hours of 7 AM and 7 PM.

Site preparation and project grading would involve dozers, loader/tractor, watering truck and excavator. Construction equipment operations are subject to an eight hour average 75 dBA sound level limit at the boundary line where an existing occupied structure is located. Project aerial photos show existing residences located immediately to the project site are located to the north and west sides of the project. Distances from the centroid of the proposed pads to these property lines shared by existing residences are



approximately 100 feet and more. Based on the noise report, a distance as close as 95 feet from the nearest property line would experience a worst-case construction equipment noise level of 75 dBA and less with all equipment operating simultaneously for an eight hour period. Given the spatial separation of the construction equipment operations, the proposal of no impulsive type of equipment, no on-site processing of materials, and the temporary nature of preparation and grading activities, the project would comply with the 75 dBA standard at all property line where existing residences are located which is consistent with the County Code Noise Ordinance, Section 36.409.

Finally, the project's conformance to the County of San Diego General Plan Noise Element and County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.404 and 36.409) ensures the project will not create cumulatively considerable noise impacts, because the project will not exceed the local noise standards for noise sensitive areas; and the project will not exceed the applicable noise level limits at the property line or construction noise limits, derived from State regulation to address human health and quality of life concerns. Therefore, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable exposure of persons or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan, noise ordinance, and applicable standards of other agencies.

- 12(b) No. The project proposes residences where low ambient vibration is essential for interior operation and/or sleeping conditions. However, the facilities are typically setback more than 50 feet from any County Circulation Element (CE) roadway using rubber-tired vehicles with projected groundborne noise or vibration contours of 38 VdB or less; any property line for parcels zoned industrial or extractive use; or any permitted extractive uses. A setback of 50 feet from the roadway centerline for heavy-duty truck activities would insure that these proposed uses or operations do not have any chance of being impacted significantly by groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels (Harris, Miller Miller and Hanson Inc., *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment* 1995, Rudy Hendriks, *Transportation Related Earthborne Vibrations* 2002). This setback insures that this project site will not be affected by any future projects that may support sources of groundborne vibration or groundborne noise related to the adjacent roadways.

Also, the project does not propose any major, new or expanded infrastructure such as mass transit, highways or major roadways or intensive extractive industry that could generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels and impact vibration sensitive uses in the surrounding area. Therefore, the project will not expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels on a project or cumulative level.

- 12(c) No. The project involves the following permanent noise sources that may increase the ambient noise level: Vehicular traffic on nearby roadways and activities associated with residential subdivisions. As indicated in the response listed under Section XI Noise, Question a., the project would not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas in the vicinity to a substantial permanent increase in noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable local, State, and Federal noise control. Also, the project is not expected to expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to direct noise impacts (doubling) existing ambient noise levels based on review of the project by County staff and a Noise Analysis prepared by Ldn Consulting dated February 21, 2012.

The project will not result in cumulatively noise impacts because a list of past, present and future projects within in the vicinity were evaluated. It was determined that the

project in combination with a list of past, present and future project would not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to cumulative noise impacts over existing ambient noise levels. Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered.

- 12(d) No. The project does not involve any uses that may create substantial temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity including but not limited to extractive industry; outdoor commercial or industrial uses that involve crushing, cutting, drilling, grinding, or blasting of raw materials; truck depots, transfer stations or delivery areas; or outdoor sound systems.

Also, general construction noise is not expected to exceed the construction noise limits of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.409), which are derived from State regulations to address human health and quality of life concerns. Construction operations will occur only during permitted hours of operation pursuant to Section 36.409. Also, it is not anticipated that the project will operate construction equipment in excess of 75 dB for more than an 8 hours during a 24-hour period.

Based on a Noise Analysis prepared by Ldn Consulting dated February 21, 2012 the project will not generate construction noise that may exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.409). Construction operations will occur only during permitted hours of operation pursuant to Section 36.409. Also, it is not anticipated that the project will operate construction equipment in excess of an average sound level of 75dB between the hours of 7 AM and 7 PM.

Site preparation and project grading would involve dozers, loader/tractor, watering truck and excavator. Construction equipment operations are subject to an eight hour average 75 dBA sound level limit at the boundary line where an existing occupied structure is located. Project aerial photos show existing residences located immediately to the project site are located to the north and west sides of the project. Distances from the centroid of the proposed pads to these property lines shared by existing residences are approximately 100 feet and more. Based on the noise report, a distance as close as 95 feet from the nearest property line would experience a worst-case construction equipment noise level of 75 dBA and less with all equipment operating simultaneously for an eight hour period. Given the spatial separation of the construction equipment operations, the proposal of no impulsive type of equipment, no on-site processing of materials, and the temporary nature of preparation and grading activities, the project would comply with the 75 dBA standard at all property line where existing residences are located which is consistent with the County Code Noise Ordinance, Section 36.409. Therefore, the project would not result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in existing ambient noise levels in the project vicinity.

- 12(e) No. The project is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) for airports or within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport.

- 12(f) No. The project is not located within a one-mile vicinity of a private airstrip.

The GPU EIR identified significant impacts related to the exposure of any existing or reasonably foreseeable future noise sensitive land uses to exterior or interior noise, including existing and planned Mobility Element roadways, railroads, and all other noise sources. The GPU EIR imposed the following mitigation for this impact. This mitigation consistent with the GPU EIR is applicable to the project and has been implemented through the conditions of approval.

- Noi-1.1 requires an acoustical analysis whenever development may result in any existing or future noise sensitive land uses being subject to on-site noise levels of 60 dBA (CNEL) or greater or other land uses that may result in noise levels exceeding the “Acceptable” standard in the Noise Compatibility Guidelines. The analysis will determine whether significant impacts may occur and incorporate attenuation measures within the project to meet the compatibility guidelines.

The Butterfield Ranch Project will impose the appropriate mitigation measures prior to approval of the Final Map or as a condition of the Major Use Permit. The Butterfield Ranch Noise Analysis evaluated the project and the noise environment consistent with Noi-1.1. During project grading, the Noise Ordinance and Grading Ordinance would be enforced and there would be appropriate limits on temporary noise. The project would not result in significant noise impacts not anticipated by the GPU EIR. The following measures consistent with the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Noise are included in the conditions of approval:

**NOISE RESTRICTION EASEMENT:** In order to reduce the exposure to noise levels in excess of standards established by the [County of San Diego General Plan Noise Element \(Table N-1 & N-2\)](#), and the [County of San Diego CEQA Noise Guidelines for Determining Significance](#), a noise restriction easement shall be placed on the Lots 1 and 2 to reduce the noise exposure of land uses for sensitive receptors below levels of significance. The said easement shall include an analysis performed by a County Approved Acoustical Consultant, which demonstrates that the proposed Noise Sensitive Land Uses (residential dwelling units) as defined by the General Plan, will not be exposed to present and anticipated future noise levels exceeding the allowable sound level limit of the General Plan community noise equivalent levels (CNEL) of 45 dBA for interior noise, and a (CNEL) of 60 dBA for exterior noise levels. Future traffic noise level estimates, must utilize a Level of Service “C” traffic flow for a (4.2A) Boulevard roadway for Valley Center Road, which is its designated General Plan Mobility Element buildout roadway classification. The acoustical analysis shall make recommendations for the structural design and building plans to comply with the noise standards referenced above.

The GPU EIR imposed mitigation for noise resource impacts. The Butterfield Ranch Project has imposed mitigation measures consistent with the GPU EIR that will be completed prior to approval of the Final Map or as a condition of the Major Use Permit.

### Conclusion

The project could result in potentially significant impacts from noise; however, further environmental analysis is not required because:

1. No peculiar impacts to the project or its site have been identified.
2. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which were not discussed by the GPU EIR.
3. No substantial new information has been identified which results in an impact which is more severe than anticipated by the GPU EIR.
4. Feasible mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR will be applied to the project.

## POPULATION AND HOUSING

The GP EIR analysis indicated there would be development and infrastructure proposed under the General Plan Update would directly and indirectly induce population growth; however, this growth is consistent with forecasted growth for the unincorporated County. It indicated that the GP would not displace substantial numbers, but it would have the potential to result in displacement of people from the conversion of residential areas to other uses. These impacts were found to be less than significant and mitigation measures were not proposed.

	Significant Project Impact	Peculiar Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
<b>13. Population and Housing – Would the Project:</b>			
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion

- 13(a) No. The project will not induce substantial population growth in an area because the project does not propose any physical or regulatory change that would remove a restriction to or encourage population growth in an area.
- 13(b) No. The project will not displace substantial numbers of existing housing. Five vacant residential structures will be demolished.
- 13(c) No. The proposed project will not displace a substantial number of people. While the property has a ranch house, guest house and several outbuildings, the buildings are currently vacant. The majority of the property has been disturbed and for many years has been primarily used for grazing of horses. In the 1980's, a tree farm was started that used containers or boxes because of the condition of the soil. After 2.5 years, the tree farm was found to be economically infeasible.

### Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to populations/housing; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

## PUBLIC SERVICES

The GP EIR analysis indicated there would be the potential for direct and cumulative Public Service impacts associated with development of land uses proposed under the GPU. General Plan Update policies and mitigation measures would reduce impacts but not to below a level of significance. The following impacts were anticipated in the GPU EIR Public Services Chapter and mitigation measures were proposed: However, the project does not have public services impacts, and the GPU EIR determination that there is the potential to significantly impact services from the development of land uses proposed under the GPU is not applicable to the project.

	Significant Project Impact	Peculiar Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
<b>14. Public Services – Would the Project:</b>			
a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios for fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion

- 14(a) Based on the project's service availability forms, the project would not result in the need for significantly altered services or facilities. The project requires sewer service from the Valley Center Municipal Water District (VCMWD). Expanded facilities are needed prior to the provision of service. However, a project facility availability form has been received that indicates that there is adequate capacity to serve the project. The VCMWD has approved and provided environmental clearance for an expansion of the Woods Valley Sewage Treatment Plant for the Butterfield project as well as an additional 350 EDUs (January 2013). The project will be conditioned to provide a commitment of service (connection to the Woods Valley Treatment Facility and an amended Waste Discharge Permit from the RWQCB) prior to the approval of Final Map.

### Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to public services; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

## RECREATION

The GP EIR analysis indicated there would be the potential for direct and cumulative Recreational impacts associated with development of land uses proposed under the GPU. General Plan Update policies and mitigation measures would reduce impacts to less than significant. The following impacts were anticipated in the GPU EIR Recreation Chapter and mitigation measures were proposed:

	Significant Project Impact	Peculiar Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
<b>15. Recreation – Would the Project:</b>			
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion

- 15(a) The project would incrementally increase the use of existing parks and other recreational facilities; however, the project will be required to pay fees or dedicate land for local parks pursuant to the Park Land Dedication Ordinance.
- 15(b) The project includes internal pathways. Impacts from these amenities have been considered as part of the overall environmental analysis contained elsewhere in this document.

### Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to recreation; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

## TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

The GP EIR analysis indicated there would be the potential for direct and cumulative Transportation and Traffic impacts associated with development of land uses proposed under the GPU. General Plan Update policies and mitigation measures would reduce impacts but not to below a level of significance. The following impacts were anticipated in the GPU EIR Transportation Chapter and mitigation measures were proposed:

The project would introduce substantial traffic and significant direct and cumulative impacts. These impacts were anticipated in the GPU EIR Traffic Chapter. Based on a Traffic Impact Study, dated May 2, 2012, prepared by LLG Engineers for the proposed project, the project would result in significant direct and cumulative impacts to the intersection of Valley Center Road and Sunday Drive. However, the mitigation measures would reduce impacts to less than significant and traffic would not exceed the acceptable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan.

	Significant Project Impact	Peculiar Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
<b>16. Transportation and Traffic – Would the Project:</b>			
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of the effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths and mass transit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion

16(a) No. A Traffic Impact Study, dated May 2, 2012, prepared by LLG Engineers was completed for the proposed project. The Traffic Impact Study identified that the proposed project will result in an additional 852 ADT. The project trips will be distributed from Sunday Drive to valley Center Road and the surrounding community. The traffic study found that the project would result in significant direct and cumulative impacts to the intersection of Valley Center Road and Sunday Drive. However, the mitigation measures will be required to reduce impacts to less than significant. These measures include: removal of raised median and installation of center turn lane on Valley Center Road at Sunday Drive. Therefore, with the incorporation of the listed mitigation measures, the project would not have a direct impact related to a conflict with policies establishing measures of the effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system.

The proposed project generates 852 ADT. These trips will be distributed on circulation element roadways in the County some of which currently or are projected to operate at inadequate levels of service. The County of San Diego has developed an overall programmatic solution that addresses existing and projected future road deficiencies in

the unincorporated portion of San Diego County. The TIF program creates a mechanism to proportionally fund improvements to roadways necessary to mitigate potential cumulative impacts caused by traffic from future development. These new projects were based on SANDAG regional growth and land use forecasts, the SANDAG Regional Transportation Model was utilized to analyze projected build-out (year 2030) development conditions on the existing circulation element roadway network throughout the unincorporated area of the County. Based on the results of the traffic modeling, funding necessary to construct transportation facilities that will mitigate cumulative impacts from new development was identified. Existing roadway deficiencies will be corrected through improvement projects funded by other public funding sources, such as TransNet, gas tax, and grants. Potential cumulative impacts to the region's freeways have been addressed in SANDAG's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). This plan, which considers freeway buildout over the next 30 years, will use funds from TransNet, State, and Federal funding to improve freeways to projected level of service objectives in the RTP.

These project trips therefore contribute to a potential significant cumulative impact and mitigation is required. The potential growth represented by this project was included in the growth projections upon which the TIF program is based. By ensuring TIF funds are spend for the specific roadway improvements identified in the TIF Program, the CEQA mitigation requirement is satisfied and the Mitigation Fee nexus is met. Therefore, payment of the TIF, which will be required at issuance of building permits, in combination with other components of the program described above, will mitigate potential cumulative traffic impacts to less than significant.

- 16(b) No. The additional 852 ADTs from the project do not exceed the 2400 trips (or 200 peak hour trips) required for study under the region's Congestion Management Program as developed by SANDAG. A Traffic Impact Study, dated May 2, 2012, prepared by LLG Engineers was completed for the proposed project. The Traffic Impact Study identified that the proposed project would result in an additional 852 ADT. Project trips would be distributed to the following CMP designated facilities: Valley Center Road. However, no conflicts with the applicable congestion management program were identified because the project would not exceed level of service standards or conflict with travel demand measures. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant impact related to conflicts with the applicable CMP and no mitigation is required.
- 16(c) No. The proposed project is located outside of an Airport Influence Area and is not located within two miles of a public or public use airport.
- 16(d) No. The proposed project will not alter traffic patterns, roadway design, place incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) on existing roadways, or create curves, slopes or walls which would impede adequate sight distance on a road. The proposed project will not significantly alter roadway geometry on Sunday Drive (Butterfield Trails) and Valley Center Road. A safe and adequate sight distance has been required at all driveways and intersections. All road improvements will be constructed according to the County of San Diego Public and Private Road Standards. The proposed project will not place incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) on existing roadways. Therefore, the proposed project will not significantly increase hazards due to design features or incompatible uses.
- 16(e) No. The Valley Center Fire Protection District and the San Diego County Fire Authority have reviewed the project and its Fire Protection Plan and have determined that there is adequate emergency fire access.



- 16(f) No. The project will not result in the construction of any road improvements or new road design features that would interfere with the provision of public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities. In addition, the project does not generate sufficient travel demand to increase demand for transit, pedestrian or bicycle facilities.

The GPU EIR imposed the following mitigation for these impacts. This mitigation, defined by the Traffic Technical Study and consistent with the GPU EIR, is applicable to the project and has been implemented through the conditions of approval.

Tra-1.3 is the implementation of County Public Road Standards during review of new development projects. Tra-1.3 also includes revision of the Public Road Standards to include a range of road types according to Regional Category context. Application of this measure will ensure that LOS standards are met when feasible and that appropriate road types are assigned based the specifics of the development.

Tra-1.4 is the implementation, and revision as necessary, of the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Transportation and Traffic to evaluate adverse environmental effects of projects and require mitigation when significant impacts are identified. This measure will ensure that appropriate site design and mitigating measures are applied to minimize traffic increases and road deficiencies associated with future development under the General Plan Update.

Tra-1.7 is the implementation of the San Diego County Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) Ordinance, which defrays the costs of constructing planned transportation facilities necessary to accommodate increased traffic generated by future development. This measure will help reduce financial barriers associated with accommodating increased traffic and/or meeting LOS standards.

The Butterfield Ranch Project will implement the appropriate measures prior to approval of the Final Map or as a condition of the Major Use Permit. The Butterfield Ranch Project was analyzed under the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Transportation and Traffic consistent with GP MM-Tra-1.4 and will implement the following measures through completion of conditions of approval consistent with the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Traffic. The project conditions include ordinance compliance measures:

**PUBLIC ROAD IMPROVEMENTS:** In order to promote orderly development and to comply with the [Subdivision Ordinance Sec. 81.404](#) and the Community Trails Master Plan, all the public road segments and intersections as indicated bellow shall be improved. Improve or agree to improve and provide security for removal of raised median and installation of two-way center turn lane for approximately 650 feet on Valley Center Road south of Sunday Drive to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Development Services. All plans and improvements shall be completed pursuant to the [County of San Diego Public Road Standards](#), the PDS [Land Development Improvement Plan Checking Manual](#) and the Community Trails Master Plan. The improvements shall be completed within 24 months from the approval of the improvement plans, execution of the agreements, and acceptance of the securities.

**PRIVATE ROAD IMPROVEMENTS:** In order to promote orderly development and to comply with the [Subdivision Ordinance Sec. 81.404](#), all the proposed private road easements shall be improved. Improve or agree to improve and provide security for the

on and off-site private road easements: Butterfield Trails, Moosa Creek Lane, Oak View Court, Granite Ridge Way, Oak Hollow Lane and extended Winged Foot Way. All plans and improvements shall be completed pursuant to the [County of San Diego, Private Road Standards](#), and the PDS [Land Development Improvement Plan Checking Manual](#). The improvements shall be completed within 24 months from the approval of the improvement plans, execution of the agreements, and acceptance of the securities.

**PRIVATE ROAD MAINTENANCE AGREEMENT:** In order to ensure that the private roads approved with this subdivision are maintained and comply with [County Subdivision Ordinance Sec. 81.402\(c\)](#), the applicant shall assume responsibility of the private roads.

**SIGHT DISTANCE:** In order to comply with the Design Standards of Section 6.1 (E) of the [County of San Diego Public Road Standards](#), an unobstructed view for safety while exiting the property and accessing a public road from the site, and unobstructed sight distance shall be verified.

**ROAD IMPROVEMENT CONSTRUCTION FEE:** In order to mitigate the impact of this project on traffic safety below levels of less than significant, and to comply with [California Environmental Quality Act \(CEQA\)](#), a road improvement and construction fee shall be paid to help mitigate the additional traffic impact on for Valley Center Road and Mirar de Valle Road's intersection caused by the residential subdivision. Participate in the cost of road improvements for a portion of 2.19%, by paying a construction fee of \$1,440.78. The fee is to assist in financing the improvements for Valley Center Road and Mirar de Valle Road's intersection. The fee is based on an estimate of the percentage of traffic this project will contribute. The fee will be used to contribute toward the construction of street facilities such as pavements, realignments of horizontal and vertical curves, storm drains, grading, etc. The road improvements will help improve future traffic operations from the additional traffic contributions that this residential subdivision will contribute.

The GPU EIR imposed mitigation for this impact. The Butterfield Ranch Project has imposed measures consistent with the GPU EIR and ordinance compliance that will be completed prior to approval of the Final Map or as a condition of the Major Use Permit.

## Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to transportation/traffic; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

## UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

The GP EIR analysis indicated there would be the potential for direct and cumulative Utility and Service System impacts associated with development of land uses proposed under the GPU. General Plan Update policies and mitigation measures would reduce impacts but not to below a level of significance. The following impacts were anticipated in the GPU EIR Utilities and Service Systems Chapter and mitigation measures were proposed. However, the project does not have service impacts, and the GPU EIR determination that there is the potential to significantly impact existing or planned services from the development of land uses proposed under the GPU is not applicable to the project.

	Significant Project Impact	Peculiar Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
<b>17. Utilities and Service Systems – Would the Project:</b>			
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion

- 17(a) No. The project would discharge domestic waste to a community sewer system that is permitted to operate by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). A project facility availability form has been received from the Valley Center Municipal Water District (VCMWD) that indicates that there is adequate capacity to serve the project. The VCMWD has approved and provided environmental clearance for an expansion of the Woods Valley Sewage Treatment Plant for the Butterfield project as well as an additional 350 EDUs (January 2013). The project will be conditioned to provide a commitment of service (connection to the Woods Valley Treatment Facility and an amended Waste Discharge Permit from the RWQCB) prior to the approval of Final Map.
- 17(b) No. The project involves new water and wastewater pipeline extensions. However, these extensions will not result in additional adverse physical effects beyond those already identified in other sections of this environmental analysis.
- 17 (c) No. The project involves new storm water drainage facilities. However, these extensions will not result in additional adverse physical effects beyond those already identified in other sections of this environmental analysis.

- 17(d) No. A Service Availability Letter from the VCMWD has been provided which indicates that there is adequate water to serve the project.
- 17(e) No. A Service Availability Letter from the VCMWD has been provided, which indicates that there is adequate wastewater capacity to serve the project.
- 17(f) No. All solid waste facilities, including landfills require solid waste facility permits to operate. There are five, permitted active landfills in San Diego County with remaining capacity to adequately serve the project.
- 17(g) No. The project will deposit all solid waste at a permitted solid waste facility.

**Conclusion**

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to utilities and service systems; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

## References

The following is a list of project specific technical studies used to support the analysis of each potential environmental effect:

Affinis, Marcia Adams (December 11, 2012). Final Biological Resources Report, Butterfield Trails Ranch.

Affinis and Brian F. Smith and Associates, Inc., G. T. Gross, PhD et. al. (2008, rev. 2010). A Cultural Resources Survey and Evaluation Program for the Butterfield Trails Ranch Project.

Scott Franklin Consulting and Urban Wildland Fire Management, Scott E. Franklin (February 14, 2011). Butterfield Trails Ranch Fire Vegetation Management plan and Catastrophic Wildfire Risk Analysis.

EEl Geotechnical and Environmental Solutions, Polly Ivers (September 23, 2010). Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Butterfield Trails, LLC.

Tory R. Walker Engineering, Inc., Tory Walker (September 1, 2010). Preliminary Hydromodification Management Plan Report for Butterfield Trails Ranch.

Tory R. Walker Engineering, Inc., Tory Walker (October 17, 2012). Major SWMP for Butterfield Trails Ranch Tentative Map 5551.

Tory R. Walker Engineering, Inc., Tory Walker (September 1, 2010). CEQA-Level Preliminary Hydrology and Hydraulics Study for Butterfield Trails Ranch TM 5551.

Ldn Consulting, Jeremy Loudon (February 21, 2012). Noise Assessment Butterfield Trails Ranch TM 5551.

Linscott, Law & Greenspan, Engineers, Cara Leone/John Boarman (May 2, 2012). Traffic Impact Analysis Butterfield Trails Ranch.

Ldn Consulting, Jeremy Loudon (October 6, 2011). Global Climate Change Butterfield Trails Ranch.

Lewis & Lewis Development, LLC, William S. Lewis (January 17, 2011). Community Character Information Major Use Permit Findings for TM 5551.

For a complete list of technical studies, references, and significance guidelines used to support the analysis of the General Plan Update Final Certified Program EIR, dated August 3, 2011, please visit the County's website at:

[http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/PDS/gpupdate/docs/BOS\\_Aug2011/EIR/FEIR\\_5.00\\_-\\_References\\_2011.pdf](http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/PDS/gpupdate/docs/BOS_Aug2011/EIR/FEIR_5.00_-_References_2011.pdf)

**Attachment (click on the following link)**

Summary of Determinations and Mitigation within the Final Environmental Impact Report, County of San Diego General Plan Update, SCH # 2002111067

[http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds/gpupdate/GPU\\_FEIR\\_Summary\\_15183\\_Reference.pdf](http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds/gpupdate/GPU_FEIR_Summary_15183_Reference.pdf)

